

**Evaluation of the U.S. Army Training and
Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Warrior
Transition Course (WTC)**

Roy C. Campbell and Laura A. Ford
Human Resources Research Organization

Kelly S. Ervin
U.S. Army Research Institute



**United States Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

20060602025

April 2006

**U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

**A Directorate of the Department of the Army
Deputy Chief of Staff, G1**

Authorized and approved for distribution:

Michelle Sams
MICHELLE SAMS
Technical Director

Zita M. Simutis
ZITA M. SIMUTIS
Director

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army

Human Resources Research Organization

Technical Review by

Richard R. Hoffman, U.S. Army Research Institute
Kathleen A. Quinkert, U.S. Army Research Institute

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this Study Report has been made by ARI.
Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army
Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Attn: DAPE-ARI-MS
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway, VA 22202-3926.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This Study Report may be destroyed when it is no longer
needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral
and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this Study Report are not to be construed as an official
Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				
1. REPORT DATE (dd-mm-yy) April 2006	2. REPORT TYPE Final	3. DATES COVERED (from... to) February 2005 – March 2006		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Evaluation of the U.S. Army Training & Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Warrior Transition Course (WTC)		5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER DASW01-03-D-0015 DO 0017		
		5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 665803		
6. AUTHOR(S) Roy C. Campbell, Laura A. Ford (Human Resource Research Organization), & Kelly S. Ervin (U.S. Army Research Institute)		5c. PROJECT NUMBER D730		
		5d. TASK NUMBER 317		
		5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Human Resources Research Organization 66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 400 Alexandria, Virginia 22314		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences ATTN: DAPE-ARI-RS 2511 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202-3926		10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI		
		11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER Study Report 2006-05		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Contracting Officer's Representative and Subject Matter POC: Dr. Kelly S. Ervin				
14. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words): This was an assessment of the Warrior Transition Course (WTC) training program designed to provide initial entry training under the Blue to Green (B2G) recruiting program. The analysis was performed by ARI at the request of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). The assessment had four objectives: (1) provide a detailed overview of the WTC program and its participants, (2) prepare electronic databases of survey data, (3) conduct a comparative analysis of WTC and basic combat training (BCT), and (4) provide results of the assessment to include recommendations. A case study method was used and input was gathered by observations, interviews, surveys, and documentation reviews. Ten specific findings about the course were provided along with selected recommendations. Findings were: (1) Most WTC attendees were prior service, not transfers on active duty. (2) BCT and WTC were not comparable activities. (3) There was significant Soldier dissatisfaction in WTC. (4) Soldiers were not accurately informed about WTC prior to attendance. (5) Physical demands predominate WTC issues. (6) WTC was too short. (7) Leadership training was a concern. (8) Administrative issues detracted from training. (9) Use of Drill Sergeants was controversial. (10) WTC will change when the course is transferred.				
15. SUBJECT TERMS Blue to Green (B2G), Warrior Transition Course (WTC), Army Soldier acquisition program, initial entry training (IET), case study methodology, basic combat training (BCT), database development, survey development, qualitative analysis				
16. REPORT Unclassified		17. ABSTRACT Unclassified	18. THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited
20. NUMBER OF PAGES 113		21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON Ellen Kinzer Technical Publications Specialist (703) 602-8047		

Standard Form 298

Study Report 2006-05

**Evaluation of the U.S. Army Training and
Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Warrior
Transition Course (WTC)**

Roy C. Campbell and Laura A. Ford
Human Resources Research Organization

Kelly S. Ervin
U.S. Army Research Institute

Selection and Assignment Research Unit
Michael G. Rumsey, Chief

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia 22202-3926

April 2006

665803D730

**Personnel and Training
Analysis Activities**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, the authors wish to acknowledge the support and access provided by the 1st Battalion, 46th Infantry, 1st Armor Training Brigade (ATB), Fort Knox, Kentucky. At no time were we denied any request we made to the unit. All of the officers and NCOs provided the utmost cooperation and support to our observations, administration of questionnaires, and access to Soldiers and cadre. In particular, we recognize the access and support of the Commander (until June 2005), Lieutenant Colonel James Larson and the Executive Officer, Major Ralph Hudnall.

Two HumRRO staff members also deserve special recognition. Ms. Margaret Shay was responsible for administering, collecting, collating, and data entry for the questionnaires. Mr. John Fisher developed and refined the database construction and operation. Without these two individuals' contributions, the work recounted in this report could not have been completed.

We also are appreciative of the efforts of Dr. Kim Owens and Ms. Sharon Meyers from ARI for their work in developing, setting up, administering, and coordinating the on-line version of the survey. And acknowledgement is due to the interns and seasonal staff at ARI who performed the painstaking and often wearisome task of transcribing the data from the paper form surveys to electronic media. That they did so without error and without complaint marks their contribution as special.

We also thank the New Mexico Regional Training Institute for their input and acknowledge the Army G1 for providing support by giving us updated Warrior Transition Course demographic reports. We especially appreciate the contributions of Mr. Victor A. Powers from the US Army Accessions Command for his input to this effort.

We would further recognize the special contributions of the US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training (DCSOPS&T), Individual Training Directorate (ITD). Specifically we acknowledge the contributions of the ITD staff: Mr. Edwin J. Kuster, Major Clay A. Brashear, and Captain Scott B. Hedberg who assisted in innumerable ways throughout the term of the project.

And finally, a special recognition to the ARI TRADOC liaison, Dr. Kathy Quinkert who provided guidance, contacts, encouragement, patience and wise counsel both during the analysis and the preparation of this report.

EVALUATION OF THE U.S. ARMY TRAINING & DOCTRINE COMMAND (TRADOC) WARRIOR TRANSITION COURSE (WTC)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research Requirement:

In support of the Army recruiting initiative Blue to Green (B2G), a program designed to facilitate the transfer and accession of prior service personnel, the US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) instituted a four week initial entry training (IET) course called the Warrior Transition Course (WTC). At TRADOC's request, the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) conducted an assessment of the WTC under the ARI Personnel and Training Analysis Program. The purpose of the ARI analysis was to evaluate the effectiveness of the WTC in transitioning Soldiers enlisted under the B2G program and to provide observations and results, to include findings and recommendations as to changes or improvements. The analysis had four specific goals:

- (1) Provide a detailed overview of the WTC program through the collection and analysis of performance, demographic, organizational, doctrinal, survey, and observational data.
- (2) Prepare electronic databases of all survey data.
- (3) Conduct a comparative analysis of objective performance measures between WTC and basic combat training (BCT).
- (4) Provide results of the assessment to include recommendations for changes and improvements.

Procedure:

The analysis used a case study approach to detail the prevailing perceptions and assessments of the WTC by (a) its Soldiers, (b) training cadre and unit leadership, and (c) supervisors of graduates. Information was obtained through surveys, interviews, site visits, and observations. An end-of-course survey was developed and administered both in person and on-line to over 1,700 WTC Soldiers. Course descriptions and demographic data were obtained from Army records and in-course documentation and interviews. Comparative data between WTC and BCT performance was limited to unit observations and primarily focused on Army Physical Fitness Test performance and weapons qualification.

Findings:

WTC was an effective course that transitioned over 2,000 new Soldiers with very diverse qualifications and backgrounds into the Army. There were 10 specific findings from the study:

1. Soldiers in WTC were overwhelmingly prior service enlistees with a considerable break in service, not direct transfers from the Navy or Air Force.

2. While there were many similarities between WTC and BCT, the differences were more profound, precluding any meaningful comparison of Soldier performance.
3. Significant numbers of WTC Soldiers expressed dissatisfaction with their treatment during the WTC.
4. Many Soldiers were not given accurate information about what the WTC would be like prior to attending.
5. The physical demand of the WTC was the single most predominant issue identified.
6. There was a consensus that the WTC was too short.
7. Although the WTC is not a leadership course, there was a concern about placing some WTC Soldiers in units without some leader development training.
8. Administrative issues detracted from the WTC training for some WTC Soldiers.
9. The role of Drill Sergeants in the WTC was controversial.
10. The WTC, and Soldier experiences, will change when the training is relocated.

Utilization and Dissemination of Findings:

This report should serve as a start point for TRADOC WTC proponents for use in their continuing development of the WTC. It will function as an implementation document when the WTC mission is assumed by the New Mexico Army National Guard. The appendices in the report provide detailed baseline data for future and continued surveys of WTC Soldiers.

EVALUATION OF THE U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND (TRADOC) WARRIOR TRANSITION COURSE (WTC)

CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Blue to Green and Warrior Transition Course	1
History and Background	1
Purpose and Objectives of the Study	3
AnalysisData: Sources and Database Development	4
Database Development	5
Chapter 2. Warrior Transition Course Description and Operation.....	7
History and Evolution	7
Training Location.....	8
Future Training Location	10
The WTC Soldier.....	12
WTC Composition - True B2G Representation.....	12
Prior Service.....	13
Combat Experience.....	13
Age.....	14
Pay Grades	15
Race, Sex, Marital Status, Education, Employment History, and Career Intention.....	17
WTC Recycle, Holdover, Attrition, and Discipline.....	18
Chapter 3. Evaluation Method and Discussion of Results	21
Pre-existing Survey	21
Instructor, Cadre, and Command Group Input	22
Basic Combat Training and Warrior Transition Course Training Comparisons	24
Army Physical Fitness Test Comparisons	25
Weapons Qualification (M16A2) Comparisons	26
External Squad Evaluation – Warrior Challenge.....	27
Supervisor Survey	27
Army Research Institute (ARI) End-of-Course Survey.....	30
Section 1: The WTC and You.....	30
Section 2: The Army and You	34
Section 3: Your Background.....	36
Section 4: Comments	36
The ARI On-Line WTC Survey.....	41
Chapter 4. Findings and Recommendations	43
Detailed Findings and Recommendations	44
Summary	48

CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF APPENDICES

References	49
Appendix A: Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	A-1
Appendix B: Pre-Existing WTC Survey.....	B-1
Appendix C: WTC Supervisor Interview Protocols	C-1
Appendix D: ARI End-of-Course Survey.....	D-1
Appendix E: Results of ARI End of Course Survey.....	E-1
Appendix F: Results of ARI On-Line Survey.....	F-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. WTC Classes, Dates, and Seat Projections.....	4
Table 2. WTC POI Modules and Hours.....	8
Table 3. Typical WTC Training Highlight Events	9
Table 4. Percentage of WTC Soldiers by Prior Service Branch (n = 1,794)	13
Table 5. Percentage of Break-in-Service Periods for WTC Soldiers (n = 581).....	13
Table 6. Number of WTC Soldiers by Operations and Combat Theater Experience (n = 987) ...	14
Table 7. Percentage of WTC Population by Age Range (n = 1,799)	14
Table 8. Percentage of WTC Soldiers by Pay Grade (n = 1,799).....	16
Table 9. Comparison of Pay Grade Distributions – PS-Army and PS-Other Services	17
Table 10. Race Distribution Responses of WTC Students (n = 1,525)	17
Table 11. Soldier Status in the Three Months Prior to Joining B2G (n = 1,525)	18
Table 12. APFT Comparison for Overlapping WTC and BCT Classes.....	26
Table 13.Comparasion of M16A2 Qualification for Overlapping WTC and BCT Classes	26
Table 14. Proposed Sampling Matrix for Supervisor Interviews	28
Table 15. Expectations of Soldiers Prior to WTC (n = 1,527)	31
Table 16. Soldier Evaluation of WTC Instructors (n = 1,527)	32

CONTENTS (Continued)

Table 17. Administrative and Procedural Problems Encountered by WTC Soldiers (n = 1,527)	33
Table 18. Evaluation of Training Event Times by WTC Soldiers (n = 1,527).....	34
Table 19. Overall WTC Evaluations by Soldiers (n = 1,289).....	34
Table 20. WTC Soldiers' Reasons for Joining the Army (n = 1,288)	35
Table 21. Soldier Evaluation of B2G Incentives (n = 1,042)	35
Table 22. WTC Attitudes Towards Belonging to the Army (n = 1,288).....	36
Table 23. Example of coding and content for a text file for QSR N6	38
Table 24. QSR N6 Output Summary from a Search of the Term "BRM" on One Open-Ended Question.....	38
Table 25. Search Lists for the Two Structured, Open-ended Questions on the WTC Survey.....	39
Table 26. Responses – Three Strongest Features of WTC (n = 1,067)	40
Table 27. Responses – Recommendations to Improve WTC (n = 1,119)	41

EVALUATION OF THE U.S. ARMY TRAINING & DOCTRINE COMMAND (TRADOC) WARRIOR TRANSITION COURSE (WTC)

The Army's Operation Blue to Green (B2G) was both a recruitment program and a training program. It was designed to enlist prior service personnel from all branches of service: Army, Air Force, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and Navy. Following enlistment, new enlistees attended an abbreviated Army initial entry training (IET) called the Warrior Transition Course (WTC). Although many aspects of the B2G recruitment and enlistment program were touched upon in this study, the primary focus was on the WTC training. The assessment covered the first year of the training program from September 2004 through September 2005.

Chapter 1. Blue to Green and Warrior Transition Course

History and Background

The Army started the B2G program in mid-2004 primarily as a recruitment tool for active duty Air Force and Navy personnel who were facing career-limiting personnel reductions within those services. In 2004 the Air Force projected force reductions in fiscal year (FY) 2005 in the range of 20,000 personnel while the Navy projected force adjustments approaching 8,000. As originally conceived, the B2G program would concentrate on directly enlisting airmen and sailors in pay grades E1 through E5 in certain targeted jobs.¹ Once an airman's or sailor's eligibility was established (including eligibility to reenlist, physical, and weight standards), the losing service would be contacted to effect an agreement to release the individual and a new Army service agreement would be drafted. Airmen and sailors would then be discharged from the losing service and immediately enlisted into the Army with no break in service, no change in pay, no loss of benefits including retention of accrued leave, and retention of current rank and date of rank.²

While directed at personnel serving with the Air Force and the Navy, the program also included members of the Coast Guard and the Marine Corps. However, these personnel could not join while still serving with their original service; they had to first be honorably discharged, usually upon completion of their active duty contract. This opened up another category of recruitment potential that was included under the B2G program – prior service personnel from other services. And finally, the program also included prior service Army personnel. Under existing enlistment regulations, prior service Army personnel can reenlist at their same (discharge) pay grade and not be required to complete basic combat training if they had less than 36 months break in service. The B2G would accept Soldiers from the Army with more than 36 months break in service, although pay grade for reentry would be subject to determination by the Army Human Resources Command and, in most cases, would require at least one pay grade

¹ The Army identified 120 Air Force Specialty Codes that transferred into 37 Army Military Occupational Specialties (MOS) and 112 Navy Ratings that transferred to 42 Army MOS. These were the highest priority for recruitment and qualifying for enlistment bonuses. Other Air Force Specialty Codes and Ratings were also eligible but would generally require retraining into another Army MOS (Department of Defense [DoD], 2004).

² Above the grade of E4, the Army rank would be determined by the Army Human Resources Command. The B2G program also targeted officers, particularly junior officers. However, since officers would not attend the WTC training, they were not considered in this analysis (Department of the Army [DA], 2004).

reduction in reentry pay grade. In summary, there were three distinct groups of Soldiers who trained under the WTC program:

- True B2G – persons who entered the Army directly from active duty with the Air Force or the Navy with no break in service.
- Prior Service-Other Service (PS-Other Service) – persons who entered the Army with a break in service after being discharged from the Air Force, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, or Navy.
- Prior Service-Army (PS-Army) – persons who re-entered the Army after a break in service of more than 36 months.

For FY2005, the Army had a recruiting goal of about 80,000 new Soldiers and of that number, 7,300 were projected as prior service (PS). All B2G recruits would fall into that PS recruiting goal and the anticipation was that about 3,400 would enter through the B2G program.

A part of the B2G program was the Warrior Transition Course (WTC). The concept behind the WTC was that persons entering the Army from other services should not have to go though the entire nine week basic combat training (BCT), but that a shorter course could take advantage of the shared skills learned in other services. The WTC was conceived as a 4-week course that would contain Air Force/Navy to Army orientation (organization, rank, uniform wear, career progression), Army Values, physical training, drill and ceremony/manual of arms, map reading and land navigation, combatives, basic rifle marksmanship, orientation for U.S. weapons (M249, M203, AT4, M18 Claymore), hand grenades, individual tactical training, urban operations, and a 72-hour field training exercise.

The WTC was developed by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training. Responsibility for implementing the WTC training was assigned to the 1st Armor Training Brigade (ATB) at Fort Knox, Kentucky and specifically to the 1-46th Infantry Battalion, a unit of the 1st ATB that was normally assigned a BCT mission. The initial pilot WTC was conducted in September 2004.

At about the same time as the WTC was being piloted, the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Training, TRADOC, requested that the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) provide an effectiveness assessment of this new course. Assessment measures were to address the following questions:

- Is the training that occurs in the WTC effective in producing the type of Soldier needed?
- Is the training environment conducive to producing Soldiers with the qualities required of Soldiers in the Army today?
- Does the training received in the WTC meet the expectation of the personnel transitioning to the Army?
- Are there significant cultural differences noted in the performance of Air Force, Navy and prior service?
- Is the program of instruction (POI) adequate?
- Is the cadre adequately prepared to conduct this training? (*Request for ARI Research, 2004*).

Subsequently, ARI developed the “Warrior Transition Course (WTC) Assessment Working Study Plan” (U.S. Army Research Institute [ARI], 2004), which spelled out the analysis design and focused on specific means to address the global questions raised in the original analysis request. This design was translated into a Statement of Task (ARI, 2005) and the designation of a contractor to support ARI in the study. The initial requirement of the Statement of Task was to prepare an analysis execution plan for the following:

- Procedures to analyze existing WTC documentation.
- Procedures to prepare electronic database of WTC student course evaluations.
- Procedures for conducting comparative analyses of objective performance scores.
- Data collection procedures and plans.
- Procedures for conducting structured interviews.
- Procedures for building and maintaining electronic databases.
- Timelines for all tasks.

These procedures and requirements were detailed in the “Warrior Transition Course Assessment (WTC-A) Research Execution Plan” (Campbell, 2005).

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of the ARI analysis was to conduct an assessment of the WTC program to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in transitioning Soldiers enlisted under the B2G program and to provide results to include recommendations as to changes or improvements. ARI identified four specific goals for this study:

- (1) Provide a detailed overview of the WTC program through the collection and analysis of performance, demographic, organizational, doctrinal, survey, and observation data.
- (2) Prepare, document, and provide electronic databases of all survey data.
- (3) Conduct a comparative analysis of objective performance measures between WTC and BCT.
- (4) Provide results of the assessment to include recommendation for changes, improvements, and continued analysis and research for the WTC program and policies.

It is important to understand that the B2G program was made up of many parts, including the recruitment of Soldiers, the administrative process by which members of other services were processed into the Army, the Army’s overall PS recruitment and enlistment policy, utilization after enlistment, and the transition process embodied by the WTC program. To some extent, all of these parts are intertwined. However, the primary focus of the assessment was the WTC itself, not the larger B2G program. An understanding of the overall B2G program was a prerequisite, but the emphasis on data collection and analysis was on the WTC.

The analysis effort employed a three-stage design of (1) learning the issues, (2) data collection, compilation and analysis, and (3) interpretation and development of reports. The

analysis method employed a case study³ approach that focused on prevailing perceptions and assessments of the WTC by its Soldiers, training cadre and unit leadership, and supervisors of its graduates. These perceptions and assessments were gathered and synthesized to provide a detailed overview, analysis, and findings and recommendations for making changes and improvements to the WTC program. Input was obtained via surveys, job skill measures, interviews, and site visits.

Analysis Data: Sources and Database Development

The WTC program started with a pilot course conducted with 26 Soldiers starting in September 2004. This was followed with additional courses conducted at the rate of about one per month as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. WTC Classes, Dates, and Seat Projections

Class Number	Start Date	End Date	Soldier Input
Pilot	3 Sep 04	30 Sep 04	26
001	8 Oct 04	4 Nov 04	102
002	5 Nov 04	2 Dec 04	87
003	12 Nov 04	9 Dec 04	66
004	14 Jan 05	10 Feb 05	183
005	Cancelled	-	-
006	11 Feb 05	10 Mar 05	192
007	4 Mar 05	31 Mar 05	160
008	18 Mar 05	14 Apr 05	146
009	1 Apr 05	28 Apr 05	204
010	22 Apr 05	19 May 05	157
011	6 May 05	2 Jun 05	132
012	20 May 05	16 Jun 05	158
013	24 Jun 05	22 Jul 05	186
014	29 Jul 05	26 Aug 05	270
015	2 Sep 05	30 Sep 05	212

Contractual support for the ARI analysis did not start until 1 March 2005 and the initial efforts concentrated on obtaining and analyzing background and supporting documentation. Additional data obtained throughout the course of the analysis are highlighted below:

- The 1-46th Infantry had prepared an in-house end-of-course questionnaire which was administered to Classes 001 through 006. We incorporated results from this instrument into a mid-point analysis.
- ARI developed a more comprehensive end-of-course questionnaire which was administered to Classes 007 through 015. Results from this survey formed the bulk of Soldier feedback used in our analysis.

³ Case study research is most often used in complex sociological or educational settings where experimental methods are not appropriate. It relies principally on qualitative input, but uses quantitative measures where fitting. A more detailed description of the case study approach is provided at the start of Chapter 3.

- ARI developed and administered an on-line survey questionnaire for WTC graduates of Classes 001 though 006. This largely paralleled the questionnaire given to the subsequent classes.
- Class visits were conducted in February, March, June, and August during which training was observed and informal interviews were conducted with WTC Soldiers and training cadre. Additional informal interviews were conducted with WTC Soldiers during each end-of-course survey administration for Classes 007 through 015.
- Periodic visits were conducted with the 1-46th Infantry Battalion Commander, Battalion Executive Officer, Battalion S-3, and WTC Company Commanders throughout the period of late February through the end of September. We were also provided with copies of internal battalion situation reports for most of the WTC classes (situation reports were not prepared for all classes).
- We conducted a group interview/debriefing with key 1-46th Infantry personnel in June 2005. These key personnel included Company Commanders, First Sergeants, Senior Drill Sergeants, and senior operations personnel from the 1-515th Regional Training Institute (New Mexico Army National Guard). All contributors had participated in at least two iterations of a WTC. The group session was conducted just prior to the reassignment of several of these key persons.
- An exit debriefing was conducted with the Commander, 1-46th Infantry immediately prior to his change of command in June 2005.
- Interviews were conducted with a limited number of WTC graduates' supervisors. Most of these were done an extended time after WTC training and after the WTC Soldier had been assigned to a unit.

Database Development

A stated requirement of the analysis was to transfer manual survey data into an electronic database. There were four distinct datasets that were developed for the study:

1. The 1-46th Infantry in-house end-of-course questionnaire for Classes 001 through 006.
2. The ARI end-of-course survey administered to Classes 007 through 015.
3. The ARI on-line survey for Classes 001 through 006.
4. Various WTC Soldier demographic data sets identifying ranks, age, sex, originating service, service breaks, MOS, and combat/deployment experience. These were mostly obtained from Department of the Army provided Excel spreadsheets supplemented with data gathered from the two ARI surveys and data collected directly by the training unit.

To facilitate the analysis and to provide ARI with a usable future analysis tool, it was necessary to build compatible databases of all of the above data sets. This was done using Microsoft® Access. This software provided a common desktop relational database development environment that was well suited to the analysis size and related data collections and analysis.

Since there were not likely to be a large number of users for the databases, information security was not a major concern. Access database files also allowed for a range of options with respect to application development beyond data storage. We developed appropriate data entry forms for each database to maximize efficiency where possible. Each database also included structured query language inquiries and reports to facilitate analysis. As part of the final report process we delivered specific data reports and queries to ARI in an electronic format with the databases themselves delivered as native Access database files (Microsoft Access database - .mdb format). Most of the analysis of the questionnaire data was done using SAS® and Microsoft Excel. The databases are also readable by Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software.

There were three open-ended items on the ARI questionnaires. Surveys with a large amount of free-response data pose an analysis challenge. However, we used a relatively new approach to conducting the analysis of the qualitative free response data - QSR's N6 software. This process is described in detail in a later section in this report.

Chapter 2. Warrior Transition Course Description and Operation

History and Evolution

Typically, the process of turning civilians into Soldiers occurs during a nine-week period either as BCT or as an integrated course called One Station Unit Training (OSUT) for some selected MOS. Prior service personnel who have been out of service for over 36 months generally have to complete the 9-week BCT course. Under the B2G program, the goal was to shorten the required training period while still having Soldiers who were on par with BCT graduates for essential combat and soldierization skills, and who were imbued with the Warrior Ethos concepts and the Army Values. Following the WTC (and as in BCT) the next stop for the vast majority of B2G Soldiers was Advanced Individual Training (AIT) in a specific MOS and completion of the IET process before assignment to a unit.⁴

The initial WTC POI was prepared at the proponent for BCT instruction – the Assistant Commandant, U.S. Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia. The purpose of the course as developed in June 2004 was “*to provide Air Force, Navy and prior service personnel a reception and integration process into the Army*” and to “*provide a logical progression of transitioning civilians into soldiers by presentation of individual skills and tasks selected to develop a well disciplined, motivated soldier proficient in common entry-level tasks*” (U.S. Army Infantry School [USAIS], 2004, p. 2-1). Specifically, the POI was to be used in lieu of the existing nine week basic training for this targeted audience. The scope included development of self-discipline, motivation, physical readiness, and proficiency in basic combat survivability, combat techniques, and individual weapons. The WTC was designed for 224.8 academic hours to be delivered in 28 days.⁵ The POI was set up to train up to 200 Soldiers per class. The WTC POI modules and times are shown in Table 2.

This initial POI was modified several times during the course of its one year implementation. Two major modifications made at Fort Knox involved the elimination of instructional blocks on the Confidence Obstacle Course and the Conditioning Obstacle Course. In their place were substituted blocks on Checkpoint and Convoy Operations, Improvised Explosive Device /Unexploded Ordnance Awareness, and Quick Fire Familiarization. However, most of the modifications concerned implementation of the modules rather than dropping or adding modules. For example, Fort Knox increased the use of the Weaponeer and the Engagement Skills Trainer 2000 as part of Basic Rifle Marksmanship (BRM), modified the Land Navigation to include dead reckoning, and reduced the 10 kilometer road march to 8 kilometers during implementation. Early in 2005, further modification was made to incorporate the TRADOC directive to include the Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills (the so-called “39 and 9”) into IET. Most POI modifications were initiated in reaction to operational concerns and to adapt to deficiencies noted in Soldier performance. The reduction in road march distance was necessitated by the high drop out rates on the longer distance.

⁴ Precise data was not kept on post-WTC assignments for all Soldiers, only for True B2G. For that group, 233 of the first 295 Soldiers went on to some portion of AIT/OSUT. As part of the end of course survey, we asked this question of all respondents. These results are contained in item 10, Appendix E.

⁵ The POI set up the WTC as a 28 day course. Upon its implementation at Fort Knox, it was executed as a 29 day course primarily to accommodate administrative processing.

Table 2. WTC POI Modules and Hours

Module	Hours
Army Values	6.4
Basic Military Communications	2.0
Basic Rifle Marksmanship (BRM)	44.0
Conditioning Obstacle Course	3.0
Confidence Obstacle Course	5.0
Drill and Ceremonies	2.0
Field Training Exercise	72.0
Foot Marches	12.0
Hand Grenades	8.0
Hand-to-Hand Combat	5.0
Air Force to Army Orientation	2.0
Individual Tactical Training	25.4
Land Navigation	9.5
Nuclear, Biological, Chemical Defense	2.0
Bayonet/Pugil Fighting	9.5
US Weapons	9.0
Urban Operations	8.0

To graduate from the WTC, Soldiers were required to:

- Complete the Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) with 50 points in each event (push-ups, sit-ups, 2-mile run) if going on to AIT or with 60 points in each event if going directly to a unit.⁶
- Qualify (Marksman) with the M16A2 rifle.
- Complete bayonet and pugil stick training.
- Complete hand-to-hand combat training.
- Throw two live hand grenades and negotiate the Hand Grenade Qualification Course.
- Complete the protective mask confidence exercise.
- Complete foot marches of 3, 5, and 8 kilometers.
- Complete all tactical field training and the field training exercise.
- Demonstrate the capability to operate effectively as a team member.
- Demonstrate a willingness to live by the Army's core values and Warrior Ethos.

Training Location

This section describes the WTC as it was conducted at Fort Knox, including the organizations which supported the WTC and an overview of the conduct and support of the course.

1-46th Infantry Battalion. The mission of initiating the WTC was tasked to the 1-46th Infantry of the 1st ATB. The 1-46th Infantry is normally organized into four training companies⁷ and has a normal mission of conducting BCT. The 1-46th Infantry was one of two BCT battalions

⁶ In mid-August 2005, at the Initial Entry Training Commander's Conference at Fort Benning, this was modified to an overall 50-50-50 requirement for all WTC Soldiers (U.S. Army Training & Doctrine Command [TRADOC], 2005a).

⁷ Later in the training year, a fifth training company (Echo Company) was added partly to support the extended WTC mission.

in the 1st ATB. The 1-46th Infantry also conducts a Reserve Officer's Training Corps (ROTC) course in support of the Army Cadet Command to qualify cadets to enter their ROTC program at Military Science Level 3. The unit normally switches over to their ROTC posture in late May and is entirely involved in ROTC instruction until early August. To support the WTC mission, the 1-46th Infantry rotated the WTC classes through its training companies while still supporting BCT with companies not involved in WTC. During the period of October 2004 through July 2005, the battalion was scheduled to complete three 9-week BCT classes, twelve 4-week WTC classes, and five 4-week ROTC classes before resuming a straight BCT mission in August 2005. As shall be discussed later, the end date for WTC classes (originally set for 17 June 2005) was modified to continue with three additional WTC classes into the end of September 2005.

As a BCT unit, the 1-46th Infantry is staffed primarily with Drill Sergeants as instructors. For support of the WTC, there were some modifications made in companies that conducted the WTC class (e.g., the addition of female Drill Sergeants). Each WTC training company was structured generally as follows:

- Company Commander, Executive Officer, First Sergeant
- Training NCO, Supply Sergeant, Supply Clerk/Armorer
- Twelve male instructors (Drill Sergeants, with one Senior Drill Sergeant)
- Augmented with two female instructors (Drill Sergeants)

Starting in January 2005, the above training cadre were further augmented with instructor trainees from the New Mexico Army National Guard (NMARNG). This augmentation program will be discussed in detail later.

46th Adjutant General Battalion. The WTC program at Fort Knox was also supported by the 46th Adjutant General Battalion which operated as the Reception Battalion for the 1st ATB. Newly arrived trainee Soldiers (including WTC Soldiers) in-process at the 46th AG Battalion where they receive a general orientation, get fitted and issued Army uniforms, establish personnel records, initiate finance activities, receive eye and dental exams, and immunizations. Soldiers are normally housed at the 46th Adjutant General Battalion from 4 to 10 days. During initial adjustments in the WTC schedule (November 2004 – January 2005), when one WTC class was cancelled, there were some WTC Soldiers who were retained at the 46th Adjutant General Battalion in excess of 30 days.

Training Events and Support. Although there were variations among classes, the schedule in Table 3 illustrates a typical series of events of the Fort Knox WTC training.

Table 3. Typical WTC Training Highlight Events

Event	Training Day
Commander's Orientation	0
APFT - Diagnostic	1
Land Navigation Field Exercise	6
3km Road March	7
M16A2 Qualification	12-13
M16A2 Refire	14
APFT – Record	16

Table 3. (Continued)

Event	Training Day
5km Road March	17
Occupy Forward Operating Base	17
Tactical Exercise	17-22
Warrior Challenge (Squad Evaluation)	21
Clear Forward Operating Base/8km Road March	22
APFT - Retest	23
Class A Inspection	26
Family Orientation	28
Graduation	29

During the period that the WTC program was at Fort Knox, many of the facilities and programs that supported the WTC were improved. Some examples of Fort Knox innovations included:

- Construction of a forward operating base. This remotely located, realistic, and completely tactical environment was central to the field training exercise part of the WTC training.
- Construction of an urban complex. Set in the vicinity of the main training area, several 2-story buildings were used for training urban warfare skills (e.g., how to enter a building, clear a room, and military operations on urbanized terrain activities). Additionally, this urban complex supported training walkthroughs (glass house) and paintball exercises.
- Access to Weaponeer and Engagement Skills Trainer 2000. Both were used extensively to reinforce BRM.
- Evolution and refinement of the Warrior Challenge (Squad External Evaluation). This was an 8-hour capstone exercise incorporating multiple core Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills. The Warrior Challenge was characterized by realistic situations and encounters with live opposing forces. Parts of the Warrior Challenge course included video recording for after action reviews.

Future Training Location

The assignment of the WTC to the 1-46th Infantry at Fort Knox was intended as a temporary measure. Fort Knox was to pilot and initiate the program and conduct training through the first 12 WTC classes until about mid-June 2005. After that, the training would be transferred to Fort Bliss, Texas where responsibility for housing and supporting the course would be given to the 6th Training Brigade (Air Defense Artillery). Training delivery and instructional responsibility (as well as course responsibility) was to transfer to the 1st Battalion 515th Regional Training Institute (RTI) of the NMARNG and the WTC training would be relocated to Fort Bliss, Texas, Macgregor Base Camp, New Mexico, and the Onate Training Complex, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

At the direction of TRADOC, the transition of the program from Fort Knox units to NMARNG units started in January 2005. The Commanders of 1-46th Infantry and 1-515th RTI

worked out a transition program whereby a group of 1-515th RTI cadre would attend WTC cycles at Fort Knox for training and certification. During the period from January-March 2005, 1-515th RTI cadre would perform in a right-seat-ride concept of observation and training. For the WTC classes for April and May, the 1-515th RTI would be in a left-seat-ride approach in which the 1-515th RTI would conduct most of the training while the 1-46th Infantry would provide support, advice, and assistance. The 1-46th Infantry would continue to be responsible for the WTC overall and would continue to provide the actual training in several areas that required higher-level certification (e.g., combatives). The last programmed WTC class at Fort Knox (WTC 012) was to be mostly a 1-515th RTI responsibility and by 17 June 2005, the WTC at Fort Knox was to end.

However, the shift from Fort Knox to Fort Bliss did not occur. The relocation of the WTC was complicated by concerns raised over the ability of Fort Bliss to absorb the housing and range requirements of the WTC. In addition, the impending Base Realignment and Closure changes that will impact the Fort Bliss training mission also raised concerns that questioned the feasibility of Fort Bliss as a WTC training location. Various alternative strategies were developed in mid-2005, mainly centering on moving the WTC directly to the Santa Fe-Macgregor Base Camp in New Mexico.⁸ Funding was also a concern, with the initial year of WTC training (15 classes) forecast at approximately \$19 million with roughly \$7.5 million for start-up costs (e.g., facilities, ranges, housing improvements and construction; equipment; environmental impact studies) and about \$7.3 million in the first year costs for cadre pay and allowances (*National Guard Bureau In Process Review*, 2005).

In mid-summer 2005, the decision was made by TRADOC to continue the WTC at Fort Knox though the end of the FY with the addition of three more classes (013, 014, and 015). The relationship and exchange of cadre and responsibilities between 1-46th Infantry and 1-515th RTI would continue. At the close of this study, there had still not been a definite schedule or a final location established for the transfer of total WTC responsibility to the 1-515th RTI and the NMARNG.

It should be noted that the 1-515th RTI was fully poised to assume the WTC mission. They had been extensively involved in the conduct of the WTC since 1 January 2005, had done wide-ranging planning for physical and support infrastructure in order to conduct the program, and had undergone considerable preparation involving how they planed to implement the course. Although they continued to have course involvement while the WTC remained at Fort Knox, the delay in transferring the WTC interrupted the 1-515th RTI plans for course implementation and modifications and adjustments that will have to be made upon transfer.⁹

⁸ Subsequent considerations also included conducting the WTC training at White Sands Missile Range near Los Cruces (Carizozo), New Mexico.

⁹ This also affected the design and conduct of the study. There was no opportunity to evaluate the WTC under its new conditions.

The WTC Soldier

The examination of demographics was an important factor in the WTC assessment because the course was specifically designed in anticipation of a particular recruit type – namely, E2 to E4 transfers from active duty Navy or Air Force. However, most aspects of the course were directly adapted from the Army BCT curriculum which was designed to “*transform volunteers into Soldiers and deliver these quality Soldiers to the operational force through a comprehensive, 5 phased Soldierization program*” (TRADOC, 2005b, p. 12). In other words, the BCT curriculum, which assumes that the civilians entering into the Army have no military training or any grounding in the military crafts, was being used as the training doctrine for the WTC.¹⁰

In this section, we describe what is known about the WTC Soldiers in the form of their demographics. About 2,100 Soldiers attended the first year of the WTC and demographic data were obtained from a variety of sources, some of which did not always include all of the information about all 2,100 Soldiers. Where appropriate, we cite comparable data about BCT Soldiers as a means of highlighting the differences or similarities between the two groups. We present information about the following WTC Soldier characteristics:

- WTC Composition - True B2G Representation
- Prior Service
- Combat Experience
- Age
- Pay Grade
- Race, Sex, Marital Status, Employment History, and Career Intentions
- Recycle, Holdover, and Attrition

WTC Composition - True B2G Representation

Initial public relations press releases regarding the B2G and WTC programs made much of the fact that participants had transferred directly into the Army from the Air Force and Navy; in fact, this direct transfer was to be the primary focus and purpose of the program. The reality, however, was much different. The number of True B2G – those that left another service while serving on active duty and entered the Army without an official break in service – was relatively small. Altogether, 295 True B2G entered the Army through the B2G program although only 260 attended the WTC. At least some of the True B2G were from the Marine Corps and attendance at WTC was waived per Army policy. The majority of those who did not attend WTC went directly to an OSUT course or some other IET course. Of the 295 total Soldiers who were True B2G, 57% were from the Navy and 42% from the Air Force with about 1% from the Marine Corps. The 260 True B2G who attended the WTC comprised about 11% of the FY2005 WTC population. While this audience was significant in that they are the group targeted by the B2G program, this group was a distinct minority in terms of the make-up of the WTC. Almost 90% of WTC attendees were prior service (either Other Service or Army) with some break in service.

¹⁰ Prior to the implementation of WTC, personnel who were prior service and who were not exempted from BCT were sent to the normal 9 week BCT course. However, the predominant focus of BCT was on the assimilation of non-prior service civilians into the Army.

Prior Service

All of the WTC attendees had some form of prior service. A breakdown by service is shown in Table 4. This breakdown also includes the True B2G Soldiers.

Table 4. Percentage of WTC Soldiers by Prior Service Branch (n = 1,794)

Prior Service Branch	WTC Percent
US Navy	44.2
US Air Force	26.2
US Army	23.6
US Marine Corps	5.0
US Coast Guard	1.0

While the Navy and the Air Force made up the large majority of WTC attendees (over 70%), a significant number of PS-Army, presumably all or most with over 36 months break in service, used the B2G program as a venue for returning to service. These prior Army Soldiers constituted a very different training audience than either the Air Force or Navy WTC attendees.

Almost all the WTC Soldiers came with active duty experience, with less than 1% who came into the program with only Reserve Component (U.S. Army Reserve, U.S. Navy Reserve, Air National Guard, Army National Guard) background.

Table 5 depicts the WTC Soldiers break-in-service time, excluding the True B2G. The results are very revealing. The range of the break-in-service was from 2 months to 372 months. The average break-in-service for the sample was over 76 months. Significantly, half of the WTC sample had a break in service in excess of 72 months (6 years). While it must be kept in mind that this sample excludes the True B2G (whose experience is, of course, very recent), a large portion of the WTC training audience had very dated military experience.

Table 5. Percentage of Break-in-Service Periods for WTC Soldiers (n = 581)

Months Break in Service	WTC Soldier Percent
2-12 months	15.3
13-16 months	19.3
37-72 months	15.3
73-120 months	23.2
120+ months	26.9

Combat Experience

Almost one-third (30% of 987) of a sample of WTC Soldiers had participated in at least one named operation and several indicated participation in more than one.¹¹ The operations and the number who reported each are shown in Table 6.

¹¹ This information was obtained from files provided by the Enlisted Accessions Division of the Army G1. Data covered WTC Classes 008 through 013. It is unknown precisely how this information was obtained from the Soldiers.

Table 6. Number of WTC Soldiers by Operations and Combat Theater Experience (n = 987)

Operation/Theater	Number of WTC Soldiers
Desert Shield/Storm/Fox/Southern Watch (Southwest Asia)	120
Iraqi Freedom (Iraq)	95
Enduring Freedom/Anaconda (Afghanistan)	56
Joint Endeavor/Bosnia/Kosovo	13
Just Cause (Panama)	5
Restore Hope (Somalia)	5
Other	6

Soldiers who had participated in combat-based operations were very candid and willing to discuss their WTC experience, particularly the BCT approach and the lack of recognition for their prior experience and service. Their participation in combat operations was often mentioned foremost in their objections to their treatment by Drill Sergeants. This observation will be discussed in more detail later.

Age

It was not surprising that WTC Soldiers were older than typical BCT Soldiers, in that the WTC population was all prior service members. The age of the WTC Soldiers at the time of their enlistment ranged from 18 to 54 years. Distribution by age groups is shown in Table 7. Over a dozen of the WTC Soldiers were 50 years old or older. The average age of the WTC population was about 30 years. By way of comparison, the average age of BCT Soldiers was just over 20 years and about 63% of the Army BCT population was in the 17 through 20 year-old range (DoD, 2003).

Table 7. Percentage of WTC Population by Age Range (n = 1,799)

Age Range	Percent of WTC Population
18 - 29 years	50.7
30 - 39 years	42.4
40+ years	7.0

Age was an important factor in WTC training in a number of ways. Foremost was the impact that age had on physical experiences in the course. Although much of the evidence was observational and anecdotal, there was ample indication that the older WTC population had more problems with overuse injuries and recovery. Physical conditioning and progression rates were slower. As will be discussed later, the physical demands of the WTC training were a major issue in the course, a concern that may be related to the age of the population (as well as the short duration of the course). The Army has done extensive study and analysis of its "standard" BCT population and how best to approach physical conditioning. However, the WTC population and training regimen was a somewhat different experience and applying BCT physical training principles may not provide the best approach. The issue at least deserves closer study and analysis by Army experts.

The age of WTC Soldiers was an issue in the discussions with the WTC training cadre. In general, the cadre considered the mix of ages in a WTC class as a benefit and that the younger WTC Soldiers generally were well served by the wisdom and counsel of the older WTC Soldiers during training. However, some cadre questioned whether the training was appropriate in terms of the physical requirements for older Soldiers in the program, particularly for those over age 50.

It should be noted that there was a decrease in average age over the first year of the course. For the initial eight WTC classes (about 1,000 Soldiers) the average age was approximately 33 years, compared to an average of 30 years when examining the total WTC population. These numbers indicate the last 1,000 or so WTC Soldiers were much younger than the first 1,000. Whether the initial influx of older WTC enlistees represented a program abnormality is not clear, but many impressions of the problems related to the age of the WTC Soldiers were formed during the initial eight months experience. The age factor needs to be monitored to accurately determine what impact it has on the training.

Pay Grades

True B2G Soldiers were enlisted at the pay grade that they held in their service at time of separation.¹² For prior service personnel the rules for determining active duty pay grade are more complex, being a function of service branch, reserve status, total active federal service, pay grade at discharge, and time elapsed since separation. In general, however, PS-Army who were past 36 months since separation would enlist at one grade less than their separation grade, with an additional one grade reduction for each additional 6 months break in service. Reduction is generally not below E2 except where the discharge grade was E1. For PS-Other Service who joined the Army, additional factors included the service branch, the rating, AFSC or MOS held, and the Army MOS for which the person was enlisting. Determination of pay grade for PS-Other Service is made by Army Human Resources Command (DA, 2005a).

The result was that there were a manifold of ranks that attended the WTC, ranging from E1 through E7. The pay grade distribution is shown in Table 8. Regardless of pay grade, all WTC Soldiers attended the same training and were to receive, essentially, the same treatment. However, rank and pay grade emerged as a persistent problem during the year, and the experience of WTC Soldiers as a function of pay grade and rank changed over time.

In the initial set of classes the tendency was to ignore rank, particularly during training events. This was reinforced by instructor observations that many WTC Soldiers, especially those from the Air Force and Navy, did not have the technical or leadership skills commensurate with their pay grade. This was especially evident in the NCO (E5, E6) pay grades. Most cadre, and particularly Drill Sergeants, expressed the view that these WTC Soldiers were not "ready" to be treated as NCOs. Moreover, the operating tempo of BCT-like instruction was to treat everyone basically the same, and as the WTC training cadre were principally BCT instructors, this was the approach they adopted.

¹² Although the stated policy was that rank retention was only guaranteed through E4, we did not identify any True B2G who lost rank upon transfer into the Army.

Many cadre within the WTC training organization felt that if pay grades were to be recognized, it should only be towards the end of the WTC experience and that it was critical to start everyone on the same level initially. At one point, one training company forbade the wearing of rank insignia by WTC Soldiers. But, following a WTC Soldier complaint to the post Inspector General, this policy was rescinded.

During WTC Class 012, the training company experimented with using a WTC Soldier Chain of Command as a formal part of the training structure. Based on WTC Soldier pay grades, and rotating personnel periodically, WTC Soldiers were designated Company Commander, Executive Officer, and First Sergeant positions, as well as Platoon Leader and Platoon Sergeant positions. These positions were used to augment the cadre in the dissemination of information and to aid in the execution of both administrative and training events. Leadership counseling was integrated into the experiment. At the end of this class, the company cadre judged this an “overwhelming success” and recommended it be adopted into other WTC cycles. (Headquarters 1-46th Infantry Battalion, 2005)

It should be noted that it is the expressed intent of the 1-515th RTI to continue implementing such a WTC Soldier Chain of Command when they take over total WTC training policy. Their stated plan is to use WTC Soldier E6, E5 and E4 in Company Command and First Sergeant positions, E4 and E3 in Platoon Leader and Platoon Sergeant positions, and E3 through E1 in Squad Leader and Team Leader positions.

Table 8. Percentage of WTC Soldiers by Pay Grade (n = 1,799)

Pay Grade	Percent of WTC Soldiers
E1	5.3
E2	18.1
E3	22.7
E4	37.4
E5	15.0
E6	1.3
E7	<1

In connection with WTC Soldier rank, there was a fairly frequent complaint voiced during WTC Soldier interviews from PS-Army who maintained that they had been required to give up rank under B2G enlistment whereas other PS (Navy, Air Force) had not. These PS-Army expressed resentment at being treated differently from other PS as regards re-entry rank. An examination of the WTC rank structure lends some credence to this complaint. Table 9 shows a comparison of the rank distribution for 428 PS-Army compared with the rest of the WTC population. The Army population would appear to be disproportionately distributed towards the lower end of the rank structure. It is possible that the discrepancy was an anomaly but without data on the pay grade held at the time of discharge (which was not available for this study), it was not possible to tell if PS-Army were actually being treated differently or not. However, the perception among many WTC PS-Army Soldiers is that they were.¹³

¹³ It is noted that under the provisions of Army Regulation 601-210, the procedures for rank adjustment for PS-Army are fairly fixed while rank determinations for PS-Other Service are less rigid and is a Human Resources Command determination (DA, 2005).

Table 9. Comparison of Pay Grade Distributions – PS-Army and PS-Other Services

Pay grade	Percent Distribution – Other Services ^a	Percent Distribution - Prior Service Army ^b
E1	4.7	7.2
E2	10.6	42.1
E3	22.3	24.5
E4	42.7	20.3
E5	17.8	5.8
E6	1.7	-
E7	0.3	-

^a n = 1371, ^b n = 428**Race, Sex, Marital Status, Education, Employment History, and Career Intention**

Race. The racial composition of the WTC population is shown in Table 10. Additionally, almost 14% of the 1,525 respondents indicated that they were of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin or ancestry. Generally, the WTC racial and ethnic make-up corresponded with the racial and ethnic composition of non-prior service (NPS) recruits (DoD, 2003). During our analysis of the WTC the WTC Soldiers did not report any particular problems or issues that could be characterized as racially or ethnically related.

Table 10. Race Distribution Responses of WTC Soldiers (n = 1,525)

Race/Ethnicity	Percent
White	71.6
Black or African American	16.2
American Indian/Alaska Native	5.0
Asian	3.8
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.1

Sex. Based on the WTC population of 1,799, less than 9% of the first year WTC classes were female. This was considerably below the Army's female NPS enlistment figure of about 18% of recruits or of the Army's female total enlisted population of 16% of the force (DoD, 2003).

Initially the presence of female WTC Soldiers caused a few problems. Although the 1st ATB conducts co-sex ROTC training, the 46th Adjutant General Battalion (Reception) barracks and the 1-46th Infantry Battalion barracks were not initially prepared to accommodate females. This resulted in some hardships for the female Soldiers in the first few WTC classes because of off-site housing and restricted access to non-housing areas during certain periods. In addition, because of a lack of demand experience, there was also an initial problem with stockage of female-oriented products at the Army and Air Force Exchange Service facilities that served the WTC Soldiers in the Fort Knox IET housing area. While this was an area of often strong vocal complaints from female Soldiers in the earlier WTC classes, these initial problems were subsequently addressed and no major sex-specific issues were identified since.¹⁴

¹⁴ This does not mean that there were no issues concerning male or female treatment. There were some individual complaints that female WTC Soldiers were given special treatment or did not have to perform to the same standard as male WTC students. While not widespread, these complaints identify an issue that is likely to occur anytime co-sex training occurs in a high stress environment.

Marital Status. As might be expected of an older population, over 50% of 1,289 WTC Soldier survey respondents indicated that they were currently married (with another 13% indicating that they were either legally separated or divorced). This compared to about 13% of the NPS recruit population (9% for NPS males) but was more consistent with the 50% of married Soldiers in the overall enlisted population. An implication borne out of the large percent married can be seen in the high level of concern with family issues (e.g., housing, medical coverage) that was found on questionnaire items that addressed concerns of the WTC population.

Education. The WTC population was also better educated than the BCT population. 43% of WTC Soldiers indicated some college (as compared with just over 9% of the NPS recruit population). 16% of the WTC population indicated that they had a college degree while less than 1% indicated general educational development or equivalent accreditations (compared with 14% of the NPS recruit population) (DoD, 2003).

Employment History. As part of the survey, WTC Soldiers were asked to describe what they were doing in the three months before joining the Army in the B2G program. The results are shown in Table 11. Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, it might be deduced that the job market does not appear to have played a significant role in enlistment factors for the WTC population – over 82% indicated employment of some type (including homemaker or caregiver) and less than 8% indicated that they were unemployed. Almost 13% indicated full-time student status and another 6% indicated part-time student status.

Table 11. Soldier Status in the Three Months Prior to Joining B2G ($n = 1,525$)

Status or Role	Percent
Working full or part time (Civilian occupation)	69.5
Full or part time student	19.3
Reserve duty military	11.9
Active duty military	10.8
Unemployed	7.7
Other	4.7
Homemaker or caregiver	1.8

Note. Respondents could select all that apply.

Career Intentions. WTC Soldiers were asked about their career intentions in the Army. Not surprisingly, for a group of prior service personnel who had made a conscious decision to join the Army, 62% ($n = 1,287$) indicated that they intended to stay until retirement and an additional 21% indicated an intention to reenlist when their present obligation expired. Only 12% indicated that they intended to leave the Army after their present obligation.

WTC Recycle, Holdover, Attrition, and Discipline

The first 12 classes of the WTC at Fort Knox were typified by very high recycle and administrative hold rates but rather low attrition. Of the first 1,450 WTC Soldiers, approximately 33% did not graduate with their scheduled class and roughly 3% were eliminated from the program (and eventually from the Army) (J.C. Larson, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

The predominant cause for recycle or holdover was failure to meet standard on the APFT. As described earlier, WTC Soldiers had an initial diagnostic APFT and then had essentially one chance to meet standard on the APFT about 2 weeks later (see Table 3). Most WTC Soldiers had to meet the IET standards of 50 points per event, while those who were scheduled to be assigned to a unit had to meet Army standards (60 points per event).¹⁵

Passing the APFT was very problematic in the WTC. It appeared that upon entry most WTC Soldiers were simply not prepared for the APFT requirements. During the WTC at Fort Knox, only about 25% of a given class could meet the 50-point standard on the diagnostic APFT and about 17% of each class failed to score 100 points total at the diagnostic (Larson, 2005). This was compounded by the short length of the WTC training. Between the diagnostic and the record APFT, there were only 13 scheduled physical training periods. Feedback from the training cadre indicated that most Soldiers, who attended all interim physical training periods, could improve an average of about 15 points per event between the diagnostic and record APFT. Soldiers who started off well below standard simply did not have enough time to make up for poor entry conditioning.

However, the APFT was, of course, not the only physical demand placed on WTC Soldiers. In fact, the entire course was physically demanding. Muscle fatigue, stress injuries, strains and sprains were common in much of the WTC population during training. Moreover, due to the concentrated nature of the WTC training, every day during the central part of the course was a significant training event day. Sick call trends increased with the duration of the course, generally running five to ten daily in the first week to as much as 25 or more each day in the later days of the course. Evidence from the unit and from WTC Soldiers indicated that there was insufficient recovery time between most physical events for many Soldiers. The experience of the unit was that, on average, Soldiers missed about 35% of the PT periods. Thus the cycle fed on itself, and in the end there were major problems with graduating Soldiers on time.

Another reason for not graduating Soldiers on time was Weapons Qualification (M16A2). WTC Soldiers received about one-half of the BRM training of the BCT Soldiers, and the qualification rates for "first time go"¹⁶ varied from about 43% to 72% for the first 12 classes. Although the "second time go" Soldiers substantially increased the pass rate, there were still a significant number of eventual recycles (Larson, 2005). There was significant variation in qualification rates by class, generally as a result of factors which interfered with or shortened the BRM training such as inclement range weather, access to simulators, and mandatory safety stand-downs.

¹⁵ In August 2005, TRADOC eliminated this dual requirement and instituted an overall requirement of 50 points per event for all WTC Soldiers (TRADOC, 2005a).

¹⁶ Soldiers must qualify as Marksman to graduate from WTC. The standard record fire course consists of 40 target exposures at ranges between 50 and 300 meters in timed target sequences and combinations. The standard course requires 23 hits to qualify as Marksman, 30 for Sharpshooter, and 36 for Expert. Soldiers who achieve Marksman (or better) in the initial attempt were counted as "first time go." Almost all WTC classes had a make-up firing for initial non-qualifiers. Those who qualified in this make-up were counted as "second time go." Depending on time availability, successive make-up firings were conducted. Soldiers who qualified in these subsequent make-ups were counted as "third time and more go." Although retraining and instruction were included in all make-ups, at some point Soldiers who could not qualify were recycled into another cycle of BRM instruction (DA, 2003a)

The WTC Soldiers had a requirement to participate in mandatory training events (training required for graduation) on 14 of the 29 training days. Soldiers who missed these critical training events, mostly because of sick call or medical conditions, could not graduate and had to be recycled. Because of the concentrated nature of WTC there were generally no provisions for make-ups within a cycle.

Despite the discussed difficulties, in the end, most WTC Soldiers did eventually graduate. APFT-holds were held only until they could successfully complete their APFT requirement while others had to be recycled to make up training events when they became available. For the most part, the majority of the 40 or so Soldiers who did not graduate were referred for medical evaluation per Army Regulation 40-501 Standard of Medical Fitness (DA 2005b) and probable entry level separation under Chapter 11, Army Regulation 635-200 (DA, 2003b). Significantly, many of these medical conditions appeared to be for pre-existing conditions including several whose medical history showed that their medical condition was the cause of, or a contributing factor in, their leaving military service originally (J.C. Larson, personal communication, June 8, 2005). These preexisting conditions included chronic heart problems, hypertension, and chronic joint injuries or damage.¹⁷ Related to medical attrition were a number of WTC Soldiers who were referred for mental or personality evaluations and entry level separation. Overall, however, the attrition rate was not significant.

Discipline in the WTC was not considered a major issue. Early in the training year there were instances of loss of military bearing and insubordinate conduct towards ranking cadre NCOs and Drill Sergeants. Most of these incidents involved older WTC Soldiers who had problems adjusting to the WTC environment. Changes were made in clarifying the expectations of WTC Soldiers. While there were several instances of both Summarized and Company Grade Article 15s being administered and at least one absence without official leave, overall, the WTC classes and most of the WTC Soldiers were considered to be well-disciplined.

¹⁷ This was not the only instance of questionable recruit screening at the Military Entrance Processing Stations. At least five WTC Soldiers were found not to be within the height and weight standards of Army Regulation 600-9 (DA 1987). These included three Soldiers who were True B2G. The Soldiers completed WTC but were flagged and sent on to their next duty station.

Chapter 3. Evaluation Method and Discussion of Results

The use of the case study method was very fitting to the situation of the WTC assessment. The case study methodology uses both qualitative and quantitative evaluative techniques in application to a given situation to determine if the goals of a particular program are being met. Although there is an attempt to gather quantitative data, it is understood that quantitative techniques alone can obscure some of the important information needed by program evaluators. The case study method combines available quantitative data with the three tenets of the qualitative method: describing, understanding, and explaining (Yin, 1994). Case studies are typified by the fact that they are multi-perspectival and the analysis gives voice to all of the relevant groups and interests that participate in the program. Case studies also use a multitude of evidential sources as identified by Stake (1995):

- Documentation – letters, memoranda, administrative records
- Archival records – any documentation preceding the study
- Interviews – survey, open-ended, focused, semi-structured
- Direct observation – field visits, casual data collection
- Participant-observation – active involvement
- Physical artifacts – tools, instruments

Although not all sources are relevant for all studies, case study authorities deem interviews and self-report questionnaires as important sources of case study information. In the WTC assessment, we relied on a variety of sources and each approach is addressed in this chapter along with their outcomes.

Pre-existing Survey

The 1-46th Infantry had developed a 16-item end-of-course survey. This survey was administered to WTC Classes 001 through 006 covering the period October 2004 through March 2005. Due to a printing error, Class 006 only received about one-half of the survey instrument and the results were not deemed usable; therefore only the input from Classes 001 through 004 were tallied, for a total of about 300 surveys.¹⁸ Because the majority of the items on this survey were an open-ended, free response format, analysis of results was difficult and there was little quantitative data to be obtained. However, the survey did serve to provide some insights into the early WTC classes. For the most part, the themes that were identified in these early class surveys continued to be dominant or persistent topics in the later survey. A list of the 1-46th Infantry end-of-course survey questions and a composite synopsis of the survey responses are included in Appendix B.

There were several items of interest in this early survey. First, an item asked WTC Soldiers to self-assess their confidence in task performance on 37 specific tasks. Results indicated that the vast majority of WTC Soldiers felt that they had sufficiently mastered most of the WTC tasks. In fact, the ratings showed that over 85% of the respondents felt they could meet the standard in almost 85% of the listed tasks – a perhaps somewhat optimistic self-evaluation given the contradictory opinions of the training cadre. However, in the absence of more objective test measures of these tasks, this was the only quasi-objective indicator of individual task

¹⁸ There was no Class 005.

performance for the WTC training.¹⁹ There were some differences in groups of tasks. Generally, WTC Soldiers had higher confidence of performance on first aid/lifesaving tasks than on nuclear, biological, and chemical tasks, with most tactical tasks falling in between. Also, Soldiers had wide-spread confidence (94%) in their ability with the M16 despite evidence of uneven initial performance in BRM qualification.

Another area of interest was in the self-assessment of stress. The assessment of stress was divided into a variety of possible training and physical conditions. That is, the WTC Soldiers were asked how often they experienced a number of different training conditions (14 items) along with physical conditions (5 items) by using a frequency rating scale that ranged from "None," "A Few Times," to "Very Often." They were asked to assess how stressful these conditions were by using a scale of "None," "Some," to "Quite a Bit." The top two stressful training conditions were "Being pressed for time," and "Not knowing what will happen next." A majority (65%) reported that they experienced "Being pressed for time" very often and that they experienced some or quite a bit of stress as a result of this (73%). "Not knowing what will happen next" was the second most cited stressful training condition with 45% reporting that they experienced this very often and that this caused them some or quite a bit of stress (60%). For the stressful physical conditions, the majority (52%) reported they experienced "Sore muscles" and that this produced some or quite a bit of stress (55%).

Unfortunately, for both of these self-report items, there was no comparison population or survey results on which to judge the relative implications of the figures. We were not successful in obtaining similar measures from BCT classes.

Instructor, Cadre, and Command Group Input

Project staff had several meetings in different settings with WTC instructors, company commanders, unit cadre, and battalion training staff. These interviews also included staff and NCOs from the 1-515th RTI who were preparing to assume the WTC training. Some of these meetings were informal, in conjunction with observations and other visits, but some were semi-structured group meetings where the participants were asked to address specific issues and questions. In June 2005, we conducted a WTC exit interview with the 1-46th Infantry Battalion Commander just prior to his change-of-command. We also had access to a number of interim and end-of-course memos and situation reports prepared by unit personnel in their ongoing assessment of WTC.

Emerging from all these sources of information, there were many strongly felt ideas and beliefs along with a number of common themes as well as some independent thinking. The following are some of the more predominant or noteworthy information gathered in these sessions:

- A dominant and consistent theme was that the course was too short. There were a variety of examples offered in which a longer training period would be more beneficial, including the need for more physical training, more BRM, more tactical experiences, and more weapons orientation (e.g., .50 caliber, MK19). Cadre differed on how much more time was needed – from a few days to two weeks. Several felt

¹⁹ As will be discussed later, Soldiers in BCT at Fort Knox do not conduct individual phased testing.

anything short of the BCT nine weeks was shortchanging the Soldiers and the Army. A few did voice the idea that the four weeks was sufficient as a general guideline but that there should be some flexibility to spread the 29 days over a longer period to allow for holidays, inclement weather, and to allow for administrative breaks and Commander's Time periodically throughout the course.

- Almost universally, cadre agreed that physical conditioning and course physical demands were problems, and the consensus was that many of those coming to the WTC simply were not prepared physically. The opinion was that WTC Soldiers should be given a pre-WTC APFT diagnostic in the Reception Battalion and anyone not scoring 35 points for IET standards or 45 points for Army standards, per event, should not be sent to WTC but rather should attend the full nine week BCT. This was based on the observation that Soldiers only improved by about 15 points per event during the WTC physical training sessions. Allowing Soldiers in the WTC who cannot meet this threshold was, in the cadre's opinion, just setting them up for failure.
- Administrative problems for Soldiers were both widespread and a major training detractor. Although the impact associated with administrative problems may have lessened somewhat over the life of the course as the chain of command became more accustomed to dealing with them, they were still a concern. Administrative issues were different than those encountered in BCT, centering on things like Tricare, dependent identification cards, housing, and dependent medical care. Many of the issues dealt with the True B2G – at least in several instances, local commands (both the losing service and the Army) apparently were not prepared to deal with inter-service coordination in such areas as housing, dependents, pay, discharges, date of rank, and transfer of leave accumulations. Administrative problems were magnified by the short length of the WTC – not only did resolving these issues cut into training time but the ability for resolving administrative issues within the 29-day training window was extremely limited.²⁰
- Many WTC Soldiers were not adequately briefed on what to expect at the WTC. Incidents were recounted of WTC Soldiers showing up with families and with privately owned vehicles, neither of which were allowed.
- All of the cadre interviewed had one or more examples of WTC Soldiers who, they felt, should not have been allowed in the course. Some of these were extreme age limits (over 50), physical problems, health problems, and even questionable discharge conditions from other services.²¹ Many cadre felt that WTC Soldiers were not screened adequately either by recruiters or at the Military Entrance Processing Station. Many cadre expressed the opinion that persons over a set age should not be allowed in the program.

²⁰ This was borne out in follow-up with WTC graduates in AIT and in unit assignments. Many who had administrative issues in the WTC still had not resolved them, some many months after completing the WTC.

²¹ Cadre cited examples of WTC Soldiers who had barriers to reenlistment in their prior service. However, it should be noted that depending on the re-enlistment eligibility code on the DD Form 214 (Record of Discharge), a member might be ineligible to reenlist in their original service but eligible to reenlist in another service. This is entirely within the regulatory provisions (DA, 2005a).

- All agreed that Soldiers who came from the Navy (both PS and True B2G) had the biggest training gaps and the most difficulty learning Army practices and expectations in the short 4-week period. They also had the most administrative issues.
- Several of the cadre interviewed expressed doubts about the ability of Soldiers from other services to move directly into, or to be promoted quickly to, leadership positions. There was a concern primarily with the depth and scope of general Army tactical knowledge and also with their understanding of Army leadership principles. There was uniform agreement that the WTC was not a leadership course and would not help to prepare Soldiers in these areas.
- While the tendency in these interviews was to identify problems and negative issues, most participants agreed that the WTC was essentially effective in doing what it was designed to do, mainly in providing an accelerated basic training regimen. There was a concern that because of the broad diversity of the training population (e.g., age, service experience, break in service) that the course could never be the right training for everyone. Yet the cadre also saw this diversity as the course's strength, in that when properly applied, WTC Soldiers really learned a lot from each other. When asked, no one interviewed truly advocated separate courses for separate groups of B2G.

The outgoing Commander, 1-46th Infantry oversaw 10 months of WTC training and was intimately involved in planning, adjusting, and implementing the course. Generally, his conclusions endorsed the discussions with his training team members. His foremost recommendation was for an additional training week and a proposed list of activities to fill the extra training time. His conclusion was that there was a disparity of skills and knowledges between the BCT FY2005 POI graduate and the WTC FY2004 POI graduate that could at least be partially offset by a five week WTC course. He also felt that WTC training using Drill Sergeants was a distinct advantage and that the course would be less effective and the instruction less professional in their absence. He also endorsed the concept of sending selected WTC graduates to the Warrior Leader Course²² for leadership training before reporting to their first unit assignment (J.C. Larson, personal communication, June 8, 2005).

Basic Combat Training and Warrior Transition Course Training Comparisons

One of the principal questions asked of this analysis was if the WTC training was comparable to the training received in BCT. On several levels, that was a difficult question to address. To start, although there were some similarities between the two courses, there were also many more differences including a different population and different course goals and constructs. Where the training events were similar, it was difficult to identify obtainable quantitative measures for purposes of comparison. At one time, BCT Soldiers took phase tests in individual task performance for which they received Go or No-Go scores and were retested on failed tasks. "First-time Go's" provided some quantitative measure of training proficiency. In 2004, Fort Knox replaced BCT phase testing with end-of-phase situational training exercises, providing a more realistic and teamwork orientation to task performance but eliminating the individual "First-time Go" metric.

²² Formally the Primary Leadership Development Course (Army News Service, 2005).

There were three measurable areas of overlap between the two courses – the APFT, M16 rifle qualification, and the squad external evaluation (also called the Warrior Challenge Course). However, even here, comparisons must be made cautiously to control for external variables that can affect overall performance measures. For example, time of year, foliage, and temperature conditions can affect overall Soldier scores in BRM, and weather can affect APFT results. The Warrior Challenge Course was an evolving event with changing content and changing locations and conditions. Therefore, in addition to looking at overall performance, we compared the performance of 378 BCT Soldiers with that of 328 WTC Soldiers in selected events in which the conditions were at least similar. These Soldiers were selected from companies (all from 1-46th Infantry) that overlapped their training during the July through September 2005 time period.

Army Physical Fitness Test Comparisons

As noted previously, the WTC Soldier took his or her diagnostic APFT on Day 1 and the record APFT on Day 16 with 13 sessions of physical training in between. Seven of these physical training sessions centered on muscle, strength, and endurance and six sessions focused on run improvement. WTC Soldiers who were scheduled to be assigned to a unit or who were scheduled for officer or warrant officer candidate school had to meet the Army standard (60 points per event). Those going to AIT met the IET standard (50 points per event).²³ BCT Soldiers took a physical training assessment during Week 3 of training, the diagnostic APFT during Week 5 and the record APFT during Week 7. All BCT Soldiers had to meet the IET 50 point per event standard.

Passing the APFT was the largest single hurdle for the WTC training and accounts for much of the 33% recycle rate in the WTC. This difficulty was at least partly due to the short duration of the WTC training. The BCT experience was that about 3% of BCT Soldiers were sent to the Fitness Training Unit or to the Physical Training and Rehabilitation Program but the return rate to their BCT class was almost 60% versus about 20% for WTC (J.C. Larson, personal communication, June 8, 2005). The WTC pass rate on the diagnostic APFT (IET standard) was about 30% although this improved to almost 70% by the record APFT. Pass rates for BCT classes generally exceeded 95%. Although most WTC Soldiers were PS who were essentially civilians re-entering service, the observation of the 1-46th Infantry training staff was that even True B2G had APFT difficulties. It was also noted by the cadre that the Navy and Air Force have a one and half mile run (versus the Army 2-mile) and that the Air Force allows “crunches” to count for sit-ups.

The APFT difference is apparent in the overlapping comparison classes as shown in Table 12, although these WTC Soldiers reportedly generally performed better than those from previous classes.

²³ In August 2005, this was changed to an overall 50 points per event requirement (TRADOC, 2005a).

Table 12. APFT Comparison for Overlapping WTC and BCT Classes

Class	% First-Time Pass	% 2-3-or More Pass	% No-Go	High Score (300 Total)
BCT B	80	94	6	294
BCT D	92	100	0	287
WTC A	29	89	11	244
WTC E	36	92	8	279

Note: BCT $n = 378$; WTC $n = 328$

Weapons Qualification (M16A2) Comparisons

WTC Soldiers received less than one-half of the basic rifle marksmanship (BRM) training that BCT Soldiers received (four days versus nine days). During the POI development, the assumption was made that WTC Soldiers would come in with recent M16 experience. However, this was not the case. Many Air Force and Navy veterans had only limited M16 training and were operationally more familiar with pistols and shotguns. Moreover, because of the long break in service periods experienced in the WTC population, many of the M16 skills Soldiers once possessed had been lost. The average first time Go rate for BCT classes varied between 70% and 92%. With the exception of the last WTC class (which is discussed below) the first time Go rate for WTC fell between 43% and 72%.

Again the truncated nature of the WTC training apparently came into play. The WTC experience showed large variations in BRM qualification that appeared directly related to the extent of BRM training. When outside events (mandatory stand-downs, inclement weather, Weaponeer/Engagement Skills Trainer 2000 availability) limited BRM, scoring rates were dramatically affected. With fewer BRM training opportunities to start with, and no provision for make-ups, the qualification rate fluctuated in direct proportion to the number of training opportunities.

The qualification results for the overlapping BCT and WTC classes are shown in Table 13. This includes the last WTC class, which had an extraordinarily successful qualification experience, not consistent with qualification trends identified in previous WTC BRM. This perhaps illustrates the impact that training emphasis and techniques had on this measure. The 1-515th RTI toward the end of the WTC training year made raising BRM pass rates a primary goal by employing a variety of different training strategies and practices. The WTC company with notable scores was trained by this unit. While this result portends favorably for the future, it does not change the historical differences between WTC and BCT BRM performance.

Table 13. Comparasion of M16A2 Qualification for Overlapping WTC and BCT Classes

Class	% First Time Go	% 2-3-or More Go	% Unqualified	% MM	% SS	% EX
BCT B	81	99	1	86	13	2
BCT D	93	100	0	83	17	0
WTC A	95	100	0	62	24	14
WTC E	55	97	3	83	15	2

MM=Marksman, SS=Sharpshooter, EX=Expert

BCT $n = 378$; WTC $n = 328$

External Squad Evaluation – Warrior Challenge Course

The Warrior Challenge Course was a set of externally evaluated situational training exercise lanes in which Soldiers conducted squad-level tactical missions while also performing individual tasks. The squads were given a mission that included both dismounted and mounted (truck) movement. During the mission they encountered sniper fire, indirect fire, and an ambush. Part of the movement was in a built up area and included clearing and securing a building. The tasks centered around the “39 and 9” Warrior Tasks and Battle Drills. Each squad was scored by observer-controllers in three lanes and after-action reviews were conducted at the conclusion of major blocks of performance.

There were some basic differences between how the external squad evaluation was conducted between BCT and the WTC. One significant difference was that in BCT the Squad Leader was a Drill Sergeant while in the WTC that role fell to selected WTC Soldiers. There were also variations in the course layout to adjust to class loads and to time constraints as well as other differences. Because of scoring differences, we were unable to quantitatively compare the performance between the overlapping BCT and WTC companies for this event. However, there was cadre consensus that BCT perform better in the situational training exercises; the WTC performance tended to be more uneven.

In summation, it would appear that there are shortfalls between the WTC training and the nine week BCT course. The battalion commander who was responsible for both courses certainly was clear in his judgment that there existed a “disparity of skills and knowledges” when comparing the two products. The probable conclusion however, is more complex and is as variable as the WTC training population – for some WTC Soldiers the course as conducted was probably sufficient, but for a significant number, the end state after training was not equivalent to the BCT outcomes. However, the significance of this difference cannot be assessed using current evaluative methods.

Supervisor Survey

To truly evaluate the effectiveness of the WTC training in meeting its goal of producing “*Soldiers who are well-disciplined, highly motivated, and physically fit who are prepared for advanced individual training, one station unit training, or a unit assignment, and who accept the Army’s seven core values and adopt the Warrior Ethos*” (USAIS, 2004 p. 2-1), it was necessary to look beyond the WTC training itself and to follow-up on what happened to these Soldiers after their WTC experience. Unfortunately, such follow-up efforts impose high demands in terms of time and costs. Adequate sampling of post-WTC assignment results was beyond the resources of this study. However, we did conduct a demonstration experiment to formulate what approaches would be effective and identified issues applicable to future expansion of such an effort.

The diversity of the WTC training population has already been established. One of the primary concerns in doing the follow-up supervisor survey was attaining a representative sample of Soldiers matched on factors impacting post-WTC performance. Many factors were considered including age, MOS, and component (Reserve or Active Army). In the end however, there were two primary considerations that were deemed of significant interest – the origin (service) of the Soldier and rank – specifically whether the Soldier was an NCO or not. There were also other,

less influential factors, which were taken into consideration when constructing the sampling plan. Although the WTC population was predominantly male, it was also deemed desirable to include some female representation in the sample. There also was an interest in sampling Soldiers at different points in their Army career cycle. Since preparation for AIT and OSUT is a specific goal of WTC, some of the sample should come from Soldiers attending that training. However the greater proportion of the identified sample was Soldiers who were already assigned to their units. It is only after arrival at, and some period of service in, the unit that the more meaningful supervisor evaluations could be obtained. A graphic of the sampling plan is shown in Table 14.

The targeted Soldiers are identified as "Case Studies," however in application the Soldiers would be identified by a name that matched the salient qualifying characteristics. Each of the lettered Case Studies (A, B, C, D in Table 14) would be treated as a cluster. Although the demonstration sample was only set up to target 9-12 Soldiers, in a larger application, the clusters could be replicated until a meaningful sample size was obtained. Inherent in this approach is the requirement to identify the Soldiers current location/assignment and to task the unit or school to provide contact information on the supervisor of that Soldier.

Table 14. Proposed Sampling Matrix for Supervisor Interviews

Name	Origin	Unit	OSUT	AIT	Gender	Grade
CS A1	True B2G				M	E1-E4
CS A2	True B2G				M	E1-E4
CS A3	True B2G				M	E5+
CS B1	PS-OS	X			M	E1-E4
CS B2	PS-OS		X		M	E1-E4
CS B3	PS-OS	X			M	E5+
CS C1	PS-Army	X			M	E1-E4
CS C2	PS-Army			X	F	E1-E4
CS C3	PS-Army	X			M	E5+
CCS D1	Any	X			Either	Any
CCS D2	Any		X		Either	Any
CCS D3	Any			X	Either	Any

Codes:

CS = Case Study (Number)

CSS = Conditional Case Study

True B2G = True Blue to Green (no break in service).

PS OS = Prior Service Other Service (AF, Navy, USMC with break in service)

PS Army = Prior Service Army (break in service >3 years)

The supervisor survey was designed as a semi-structured interview in which a trained and knowledgeable staff member would follow an interview protocol but would take each interview in whatever direction and focus was appropriate to the situation. The interview protocols are in Appendix C. The target of the interview was the Soldier's most immediate supervisor. It was also realized that interviews for Soldiers still in IET, while following the same general procedure, would have to be modified somewhat to fit the particular circumstances of these programs. Most of the interviews were designed to be conducted by telephone.

For purposes of the demonstration, we initially identified 25 WTC Soldiers for participation. The initial supervisor interviews were conducted with three supervisors at Fort Hood, Texas. These were face-to-face interviews conducted in conjunction with another data

collection at Fort Hood. Subsequently, two more interviews were conducted telephonically at a later date. All five Soldiers were True B2G. While five cases were hardly enough from which to reach any conclusions about the WTC, the information none-the-less should serve to stimulate interest:

- With one exception, all Soldiers had adjusted well or very well to the Army. Two had been promoted to E5 and one was awaiting centralized promotion board results.
- Technical (job) performance was rated at least equal to peers in all cases. Common Soldier skills were rated as slightly below peers in two of the cases but supervisors in these cases said they made allowance for the Soldier's background. All five were rated as below the average of their peers in Army customs, courtesies, and traditions.
- Only one supervisor was aware of continuing administrative problems and these problems were extensive. That case was a more senior B2G Soldier who had attended a significant number of schools and other training and there was difficulty in equating schooling, performance ratings, and other criteria in the Soldier's file for promotion board review.
- Four of the five supervisors said their WTC Soldier had provided them information about the WTC that was largely negative. (The fifth supervisor said he had never discussed it with his Soldier.) One of the four Soldiers was very vehement that the WTC experience had permanently altered her perception of the Army and she subsequently took advantage of a medical option to obtain a discharge. Her supervisor considered this a loss to the Army and stated he tried to dissuade her. Reportedly, part of the problem related to stress injuries that occurred during WTC, but the major issue was disillusionment with the Army that was blamed on WTC.
- All supervisors said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall performance of their WTC Soldiers including how the WTC Soldiers integrated into the unit and embodied core values and Warrior Ethos. For those Soldiers in leadership positions, there were no problems expressed by supervisors.

While the limited results from the demonstration reinforced the perceived value of conducting such a survey, it also highlighted the logistical and administrative difficulties involved in such an approach. To achieve the five interviews we obtained required extensive TRADOC intervention and personal contacts as well as utilization of non-project resources, outside of normal channels. This was combined with resource-intense efforts to identify WTC Soldiers' units, supervisor identities, and finally, to make actual contact with the supervisor. The experience pinpointed the difficulty in accessing Soldiers and supervisors especially during the current operational climate.²⁴ Any future replication of this effort would require extensive planning, troop support, coordination and, most importantly, endorsement by the Army across a number of operational commands and jurisdictions.

²⁴ It must be noted that once contact was finally made with the supervisors, all were extremely cooperative and provided extensive detail in discussing their Soldiers. Universally, they were also very interested in the WTC program.

Army Research Institute (ARI) End-of-Course Survey

Early in the study, staff from ARI designed a survey instrument specifically aimed at supporting the goals of the WTC evaluation. The survey was piloted and refined and the final product is included as Appendix D. The survey was six pages long and consisted of 37 items. Most of the items were designed for quantitative replies and analysis; however provisions were also made for open-ended input by the Soldiers.

This survey was administered to WTC Classes 007 through 015 at the end of the training, usually one or two days prior to graduation. Administration was in a group setting at the 1-46th Infantry facilities. The surveys were administered by a research team member with no unit cadre or instructors present during the administration. Soldiers were given a briefing on the purpose of the survey, assured confidentiality of their input, and signed a Privacy Act and Consent Form. All survey instruments were collected and maintained by research staff personnel. Overall, the survey was well received and most Soldiers seemed eager to participate. The survey administrators were often sought out during and following the administration by Soldiers with additional verbal comments and input. The survey was administered to 1290 WTC Soldiers – almost 70% of the WTC population.²⁵

The survey was divided into four main sections:

- Section 1: The WTC and You
- Section 2: The Army and You
- Section 3: Your Background
- Section 4: Comments

The major results of each of these survey sections are discussed in detail in the following sections. Thirty four of the thirty seven questions on the ARI survey were limited response questions, meaning that the Soldiers had to chose one or more of the answers provided (although there are several questions that asked them to explain if they chose an “Other” option). The data were entered from the paper surveys into a Microsoft® Office Access database. The Access database was transformed into a SAS® readable data file using a software program called DBMS/Copy for Windows. A SAS® program was written to read in the data and provide frequency counts and percentages for each possible response to the questions. Missing data, where Soldiers did not mark an answer, were not included in the results. A detailed breakout of all of the quantitative item survey results is contained in Appendix E.

Section 1: The WTC and You

This section dealt with all aspects of the WTC course, from how Soldiers learned about the WTC and B2G to their expectations of the WTC to their experiences in the course itself. By far, the Soldiers (over 89%) found out about the WTC though a recruiter, either an Army recruiter or a recruiter from another service. However, of those that learned about WTC from a recruiter ($n = 1,107$), over 74% rated their recruiter as being “Not at all Knowledgeable” about the detailed aspects of the WTC. Only 2% rated their recruiters as being “Very Knowledgeable.”

²⁵ Another 238 WTC Soldiers took the survey on-line. This will be explained in a later section.

Clearly there was disconnect between what information recruiters had and the realities of the WTC, at least as perceived by those who attended the WTC.

An issue of some concern in the evolution of the WTC at Fort Knox was how the WTC Soldiers would be treated. The initial public announcements for the B2G program and the WTC training included such statements as “*Training and Doctrine Command created a list of basic skills these new Soldiers will need to have. These skills will be taught by instructors, not drill sergeants and the new Soldiers will be treated as non-commissioned officers*” (American Forces Press Service, 2004) and “*They (WTC Soldiers) need to learn the basics of how the Army is structured, it is not a return to basic training for them, they have gone through one with their own services,*” quoting an Army G1 officer (Courtney Hixson Army News Service, 2004). Even the 1-46th Infantry website on the WTC at one time identified such characteristics as “*Receive Soldiers as accepted professionals; Atmosphere similar to Basic NCO Course (BNCOC); TRADOC Regulation 350-6 Phase V+ privileges; and Drill Sergeants use a Teach, Coach, and Mentor Approach*” (WTC Culture, 2005). However, the reality of the WTC program was that it had a more diverse training audience than anticipated at its inception. During the initial classes, the WTC cadre observed marked differences in discipline and military courtesy with regard to relationships between ranks, particularly among some (but not all) prior service Air Force and Navy personnel. There were several incidents of insubordinate actions towards senior cadre NCOs and Drill Sergeants. Several different treatment approaches were tried with the WTC Soldiers but in the end, the more uniform approach was to treat everyone more like basic trainees than like attendees at Non-Commissioned Officer Education System courses. The end result was that WTC was not conducted as the advance billing indicated it would be.

The expectations of the WTC Soldiers are shown in Table 15. Soldiers were asked to respond to each condition listed as to whether or not they expected to experience the condition based on information they had prior to arriving at the Fort Knox WTC. A significant number (52%) expected to encounter a “gentleman’s course” and the “gentleman’s course” characterization seems to have arisen from information supplied by the recruiter (many WTC Soldiers in interviews confirmed the use of this term by the recruiters). While most of the respondents expected to encounter rigorous physical fitness requirements, a significant proportion (40%) did not. This confirms the cadre observation that many attendees had not done anything to get themselves in physical condition prior to arrival at the WTC.

Table 15. Expectations of Soldiers Prior to WTC (n = 1,527)

Condition	Percent Yes-Expected
Would be a transition course	91.6
Would be an Army introductory course	77.6
Would be strenuous physical fitness requirements	59.7
Would be an Army gentleman’s course	51.7
Would be taught by Drill Sergeants	48.8
Would go through Army basic training	22.8

Note. 14.5% of respondents indicated they did not know they were going to WTC and had no expectations.

Another item on the survey dealt with WTC Soldiers experiences with illness or injuries including stress related muscular or joint injuries. Of 1,289 Soldiers, only 28% reported that they did not have any problems whatsoever. About 41% self-reported illness or injuries that resulted

in them going on sick call. This finding was in line with the cadre observations and concerns about the amount of training time lost from WTC Soldiers on sick call or profile. However, another 30% of the Soldiers reported that they experienced illness or injuries but did not go on sick call. Interviews with Soldiers revealed that many purposely avoided sick call because they knew that they might pick up a profile and feared recycle for missing mandatory training events. This finding is borne out by cadre observations that sick call rates increased dramatically once mandatory training events were over. Overall, the 71% sickness/injury reporting seems high and should be an area of concern. Although the WTC population is older and perhaps more subject to injury, an analysis of the data shows that it was primarily the older population who were willing to endure illness/injury without going on sick call. Although training time lost to sick call was a concern, so too should be the risk of permanent or aggravated conditions from lack of treatment. However, only a more detailed medical analysis of the types of injuries and illness (both treated and untreated) can properly assess the severity of this issue and suggest remedies.

WTC Soldiers were asked how often they were treated as if they were a basic training recruit during the WTC. 70% responded "Often, Very Often or Almost Always." Only 7% responded "Seldom, if ever." These responses would probably come as no surprise to the training cadre who, for the most part, conducted much of the training by their accustomed BCT principles and procedures. However, this approach was a problem for many of the WTC Soldiers, as indicated in individual interviews. It is also reflected in Table 16 which shows the ratings Soldiers gave of their instructors as a group. The instructor criteria of "setting standards, technical competence, enforcing standards, and instilling commitment" were given high marks while "treats students with respect and respects prior military service and skills" were given low marks.

Quite clearly there was a difference in perceptions about treatment. Through interviews, it was apparent that the cadre saw this approach as necessary to get the job done and achieve the highest level of training possible in a short period of time; conversely, many WTC Soldiers saw the instructors' methods as not recognizing their worth, experience, and accomplishments as individuals.

Table 16. Soldier Evaluation of WTC Instructors (n = 1,527)

Instructor Criteria	% Poor/ Very Poor	% Fair	% Good/ Very Good
Sets high standards of good order and discipline	10.7	22.0	66.3
Demonstrates technical competence	12.9	21.1	64.6
Enforces standards for good behavior	14.4	23.8	60.3
Instills commitment to selfless service	14.3	24.0	60.1
Demonstrates Army Values	16.7	25.5	56.2
Overall leadership effectiveness	18.2	24.0	55.8
Sets good example behaving the way they want Soldiers to behave	21.2	23.8	53.7
Helps develop your skills/competencies	22.8	28.5	46.0
Provides support and encouragement	27.2	26.1	45.2
Provides feedback on training	27.8	28.4	42.2
Treats WTC students with respect	42.8	25.0	30.9
Respects your prior military experience and job skills you have	51.8	21.3	23.3

Note. Totals do not equal 100% because of unmarked responses.

Soldiers were also asked about the administrative or procedural problems that they encountered. The problem areas and the responses are shown in Table 17. Perhaps not surprisingly, the areas most often identified as problem areas by unit leaders (e.g., pay, rank adjustments, family housing and benefits) appeared to affect relatively few WTC Soldiers. Yet when these problems occurred, they were usually more severe and demanded more time and effort from all concerned to resolve. Moreover, in many cases these administrative issues stayed with the Soldier after WTC. By far, the issues with the most widespread impact were the lack of adequate information about the WTC course and recovery time between physical events – both themes that have been identified in other sources.

Overall, the incidence of administrative and procedural problems was quite high – almost all Soldiers reported at least “Some” problems with the listed items. Some of the administrative and particularly the procedural problems were undoubtedly due to the newness of both the B2G program and the course. However, analysis of the responses over time showed no pattern of subsiding. As noted, the administrative problems (e.g., pay, benefits, rank) detracted from training focus, but so too did the more procedural problems (e.g., mental stress, availability of housing and services, lack of information) because these also interfered with the Soldier’s attention to training. While there is no comparable data from BCT Soldiers, the training unit cadres’ observation was that WTC administrative problems were more unique, widespread, and persevering than what they experienced with BCT Soldiers. It must be pointed out that, of the problem areas listed, many were ones over which the training unit had no direct control. Yet there was no other single source of remediation for the problems areas, whether they were training related or not, other than the training unit.

Table 17. Administrative and Procedural Problems Encountered by WTC Soldiers (n = 1,527)

Problem Areas	None/Little/ Some Extent	Moderate/Great/ Very Great Extent
Loss of housing/benefits for family	82.6	15.4
Loss of rank/demotion	76.8	20.4
Loss of pay/benefits	73.0	25.0
Available housing upon arrival at WTC	71.9	25.9
Available uniforms and related gear at WTC	62.5	35.7
Too much downtime between training events	62.3	35.7
Mental stress	56.4	41.6
Length of time spent in Reception Battalion	50.3	47.4
Ability to purchase needed items in PX/Shopette	48.6	49.5
Not enough training time	42.1	54.9
Not enough recovery time between physical events	41.0	57.5
Lack of proper information to prepare for WTC	20.8	76.6

Note. Percentages do not equal 100% because of unmarked responses.

When Soldiers were asked to look back at their WTC experience and make a choice between a four week WTC training and a nine week BCT course for follow-on B2G Soldiers, of the 1220 who responded, 53% picked the nine week BCT over the 47% who selected the four week course they had just experienced. When questioned about the amount of time allotted to specific training events, at least 45% of the Soldiers felt there was not enough time allotted to seven of the nine major training events that made up the course (see Table 18).

Table 18. Evaluation of Training Event Times by WTC Soldiers (n = 1,527)

Time allotted to:	% Too Short	% Just Right	% Too Long
Land navigation	57.9	38.7	2.2
Physical training	54.2	41.3	3.3
Drill & Ceremony	49.8	40.5	7.5
Squad evaluation	47.1	45.9	3.2
Army organization/orientation	45.4	48.0	4.0
Basic rifle marksmanship	44.6	46.5	7.9
Army customs/courtesies	45.2	49.0	4.1
First aid	28.5	62.9	6.8
Tactical footmarches	28.0	61.4	9.1

Note. Percentages do not total 100% due to unmarked responses.

The final three questions in this section addressed Soldiers' overall opinion of, and satisfaction with, the WTC. Soldiers were asked three separate questions shown in Table 19. The response patterns are somewhat contradictory. While Soldiers overwhelmingly (83%) felt at least some confidence that the WTC had been successful in preparing them for their next assignment, the overall responses in the other two items was negative. Less than one-half of the Soldiers were somewhat positive about recommending WTC to others and 68% had neutral, mixed or worse feelings of satisfaction with their WTC experience. Soldiers in their responses seemed to be making a distinction between the training events of the course and their treatment which they largely see as a negative. These reactions serve as an important benchmark for future measurements.

Table 19. Overall WTC Evaluations by Soldiers (n = 1,289)

How confident that WTC has prepared you?		Would you recommend WTC to others?		How satisfied are you with WTC experience?	
Very confident	12.7	Definitely yes	14.2	Very satisfied	7.9
Confident	32.5	Probably yes	33.8	Satisfied	23.6
Somewhat confident	37.3	Probably no	23.1	Neutral /mixed feelings	39.8
Not at all confident	12.8	Definitely no	17.9	Dissatisfied	17.6
Not sure	3.5	Don't know	9.8	Very dissatisfied	9.8

Note. Totals do not equal 100% because of unmarked responses.

Section 2: The Army and You

In this section, WTC Soldiers were asked several questions about their reasons for joining the Army and about their views on service in the Army. Since some of the items dealt with general attitudes and expectations and did not pertain directly to the WTC experience, not all the results will be detailed here (they are included in Appendix E). The following results are of particular interest to the WTC function and operation.

Soldiers were asked to rank a list of reasons for joining the military on a scale from "Not at all Important" to "Extremely Important." The results are shown in Table 20. Overall, the results were probably not very different from the reasons most NPS enlistees would find important. "Service to the country" certainly ranked highest. Experiences with the non-Army prior service did not appear to have been a significant issue for a large number of the WTC population.

Table 20. WTC Soldiers' Reasons for Joining the Army (n = 1,288)

Reasons For Joining Army	% Very/Extremely Important
Serve country	69.0
Career opportunities/advancement	68.4
Educational opportunities	65.9
Training opportunities	65.0
Pay/benefits	62.8
Fight War on Terrorism	60.3
Family support	58.5
Finish years to retirement	56.8
Experience military life	38.2
Opportunity to travel	38.0
Lack of advancement in prior service	32.5
Could not stay in prior service	12.3

Note. Soldiers rated all reasons on a scale from "Not at all Important" to "Extremely Important."

Perhaps of greater interest is the information shown in Table 21. In this item (which targeted WTC Soldiers who had a prior service other than with the Army), Soldiers rated the influence of four incentives on their decision to join under the B2G program. Ratings were on a five point scale from "Little or no extent" to "Very great extent." One item of interest asked about the incentive of "4-week WTC instead of 9-week BCT." While this was not as highly ranked overall as some of the other incentives, only 11% of the 1042 respondents rated that this had "Little or no" influence. Since one of the primary alternatives to WTC is to send at least some of the B2G population through BCT, this response is enlightening. Probably no one, regardless of their service, really "enjoyed" their basic training experience. If repeating BCT was the only alternative, the effect this might have on the ability of the B2G program to draw enlistees must be examined. Certainly it would appear to be a significant factor influencing potential B2G decisions. Whether it would be a deciding factor is open to question, but any wholesale departure from the WTC training towards a BCT option should be examined carefully in view of the potential impact this might have on the ability to recruit PS persons.

Table 21. Soldier Evaluation of B2G Incentives (n = 1,042)

Incentive To Join B2G	% Great/Very Great Influence
Maintain military benefits	41.5
Maintain prior rank	40.2
4-week WTC vs. 9-week BCT	35.5
Maintain MOS	16.8

Note. Respondents rated all incentives on a 5-point scale.

The final item of WTC interest in this section of the survey was Item 19 which reflected WTC Soldier commitment. In this item, Soldiers were asked to rate (on a five point scale) how much they agreed or disagreed with a list of statements about their feelings toward the Army. Four of the statements of particular interest are shown in Table 22. Over one-third of the Soldiers indicated that they were "Undecided" about their "fit" within the Army, and almost half of the WTC Soldiers indicated either doubtful or negative reaction to pro-Army reflections of commitment to the Army. Clearly the WTC was not reaching everyone in building a sense of cohesion, group esprit, inspiration, enthusiasm, and devotion to the Army that would be hoped. Perhaps to do this in four weeks is a challenge, but for most WTC attendees, this first Army

experience will go a long way toward shaping their attitudes toward the Army throughout their tour of duty. The attitudes reflected in the listed statements have much to do with contributing to the tenuous Warrior Ethos; missing an opportunity to build more widespread Soldier commitment is lamentable. Although perhaps not too much should be conclusively made of responses on a single question, the role of the WTC in shaping Soldier long-term attitudes should be more closely examined with an eye towards enhancing this function.

Table 22. WTC Attitudes Toward Belonging to the Army (n = 1,288)

Statement	% Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	% Undecided	% Agree/ Strongly Agree
The Army has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	8.2	26.7	63.2
I feel like part of a family in the Army	13.7	31.3	53.7
I feel a strong sense of belonging in the Army	12.4	33.2	53.0
I feel emotionally attached to the Army	18.1	38.9	39.4

Note. All statements were rated on a 5-point scale.

Section 3: Your Background

This section contained 14 items (see Appendix D), some of which dealt with demographic data that was more fully represented in Army databases obtained separately. The rest of the information in this section is reported in the section headed WTC Soldier Demographics earlier in this report. Two items (30 and 31) asked specifically about the Soldiers previous and current military jobs. The data about previous military jobs was largely undecipherable because of differences in service specific responses. Data on current MOS was available from Army databases, however this was judged to have little impact on the WTC analysis.

Section 4: Comments

The Analysis Method. This section of the survey allowed WTC respondents the opportunity to give their own free-responses with little restriction or structure on their replies. Traditionally, open-ended items have been difficult to analyze, especially when a large number of participants are involved, because getting some kind of quantitative results takes too much time, requires intensive subject matter expert analyses, or both. However, a new software program makes it more efficient to do qualitative data analysis, especially if the questions are focused and specific. QSR N6 software (developed by QSR International) was used to organize and analyze the three open-ended items on Section 4 of the WTC survey. The N6 software (a program formally called NUD*IST)²⁶ was specifically designed to conduct analyses of qualitative input (interview transcripts, field notes, event descriptions) – it is a toolkit designed to code text documents and to analyze and explore that coding. As applied to the three items in the Comments section of the

²⁶ NUD*IST (non-numerical unstructured data – indexing, searching, and theorizing) was the prototype program replaced by N6. The contractor had N6 available because of support of other work. Acquisition of specialty software solely for the purpose of analysis of the limited free-response items on the WTC questionnaire could probably not be justified.

WTC survey, it should be noted that QSR N6 was effective in yielding results for the first two questions, but was less successful in identifying specific themes in the third question because that item was so wide-ranging in its request. The three open-ended items in the survey were:

1. In your opinion, what are the three strongest features of the WTC?
2. What recommendations would you make to improve the WTC?
3. We are interested in any other comments you may have about the WTC, even if the topic was not covered in this survey.

The main activity in preparing data for analysis in QSR N6 is to determine how the response data are to be organized. The premise of QSR N6 is simple—it is a word and phrase search tool. The key to using it successfully is deciding how to organize the data before it is entered into the program. The variables by which the user wants to examine the data (e.g., sex, height) must be identified and coded before the response data is entered into the software. N6 has specific requirements for reading variable codes. The responses from each individual survey must be coded by the variables to be examined. For the WTC survey, project analysts determined that the most relevant breakouts from the open-ended items were prior service branch and WTC class number. By using such identifiers, we could compare responses from PS-Army to those who were PS-Other Service (prior service in Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard), or we could make comparisons by Class (007 – 015).²⁷ For example, Class 007 responses could be compared to Class 015 responses on the open-ended questions.

To obtain relevant breakdowns, a code was developed to label the variables and open-ended questions. For every completed survey, a text file was created that consisted of the Soldier's WTC class number (e.g., WTC9), a place number in that class (1 through the number of Soldiers in that class who completed the survey), his/her prior service experience (Army [coded as PS] or other [coded as B2G]), and his/her responses to the three open-ended questions (OE1-OE3). If a participant did not respond to a question, then the word "Blank" was entered.²⁸

Table 23 illustrates an example of what the contents of a typical text file looked like that was input into the N6 software. This was the written response from a Soldier in WTC Class 009 (WTC Soldier 63), and their prior service was a service other than Army. In all, 1,317 text files were created, one for every paper-based survey that was completed. The file was then saved with a filename that mirrored the code within the file—the content in Table 23 was saved as WTC9-63B2G.txt. The syntax and punctuation within each file had to be exact, or the data would not be read correctly. For instance, each variable code had to be preceded by an asterisk (*) and the responses to each question had to start on the line directly below the question identification code (OE1, OE2, or OE3).

²⁷ If a particular variable was not coded when data from the questionnaire was entered, then it could not be examined. For instance, we did not code sex as a variable and therefore had no way to compare how females responded versus males (this is just an example; sex was not included because it was not considered to be an important factor for comparison).

²⁸ "Blank" was typed in so that a search could be conducted on that particular word and counted. This way, we could get a specific count of items that were left unanswered.

Table 23. Example of coding and content for a text file for QSR N6

*WTC9
*63
*B2G

*OE1
Building physical fitness and stamina. Battle drills, combat and tactical practices. Military life.

*OE2
More land nav. Use of actual tear gas and use of mask at FOB. More marches.

*OE3
Recruiters and personnel at reserve and active duty need to get information about WTC, as they do not have much knowledge, in my case they issued my uniforms before coming here. APFT should be done prior to coming to WTC as some were not ready and some exceeded fat percentages. Need more instruction about tactical antiterrorist practices. Making sure prior service coming here, that all students know what to expect as far as luggage and personal items and cash they should bring.

Once all of the data had been entered and coded, the next step was to determine the most appropriate words, acronyms, and phrases to search. The project analyst who had collected the surveys from Soldiers and who created the QSR N6 text files was very knowledgeable about the answers Soldiers had written. For each question, the analyst created a list of words and phrases to search. For instance, on the first open-ended question (OE1), one of the search terms was BRM. An unrestricted search of "BRM" on all of the responses for OE1 yielded the summary output seen in Table 24. The results show that 179 of the 1,317 Soldiers (14%) mentioned BRM as a strong feature of the WTC.

Table 24. QSR N6 Output Summary from a Search of the Term "BRM" on One Open-Ended Question

- Results of text search for 'BRM':
- Total number of text units found = 179
- Finds in 179 documents out of 1317 online documents, = 14%.
- The online documents with finds have a total of 1886 text units, so text units found in these documents = 9.5%.
- The selected online documents have a total of 14047 text units, so text units found in these documents = 1.3%.

Note that in Table 24, a text unit is mentioned; a text unit is a string of words from the start of a sentence to a comma (,) or a period (.). Therefore, of the 1,317 responses to all the open-ended questions, Soldiers wrote a total of 14,047 text units. However, for the purposes of this study, the only useful data from the summary is the third bullet (percentage finds out of total documents). In addition, each time a word or phrase is found in a text file, the output file shows the text file identifier in which the word/phrase was found along with the text unit or units in which the

word was found (e.g., *Searching document WTC11-33B2G...BRM, PT, Warrior Challenge*). This allows the analyst to look through the responses and determine the context of the answer for the word that was searched.

The search lists of words and phrases for OE1 and OE2 can be seen in Table 25. Words with similar meanings could be searched simultaneously; for example, one of the common themes in the OE1 responses was that a strong feature of the WTC was its length (4 weeks) but, this could be phrased in a multitude of ways. After reviewing many of the responses, we determined that the most common words that respondents used when discussing this were *short, length, quick, and 4 weeks*. Therefore, a search scheme was written to identify any response that used one of these words.

For every word and/or phrase on the list, the percentage of finds or hits was recorded. For OE1 (which asked for the three strongest features of the WTC), the searched words/phrases were ordered from most commonly mentioned to least (see Table 25). For OE2 – a question addressing participants' recommendations for improving the WTC – the searched words/phrases required a little more analysis to determine the substance of their usage. For example, after reviewing the way the word pair “cadre/instructor,” mentioned by 18% of the participants, was used in context, it was determined that participant's were generally referring to their preference for cadre and/or instructors versus Drill Sergeants.

Table 25. Search Lists for the Two Structured, Open-ended Questions on the WTC Survey

Open-ended Question 1	Open-ended Question 2
PT	Organization
FTX	Length/longer/weeks/extend
BRM	Respect/treatment
Teamwork	Time management
Discipline	Communication
DS (for drill sergeant)	Schedule
Respect	More PT
Intro/introduction	Customs/courtesies
Hands-on	Prior service
Physical fitness	Injury/injuries
Refresher	Adults
Land nav/navigation	Recover/recovery
US weapons/weapons	Recruiters
Warrior challenge	Sick call
Camaraderie	Standards
Length/quick/short/4 weeks	Downtime/free time
BCT	Yelling/cussing/demean/degrade
Army values	Cadre/instructors
Military bearing	No DS (drill sergeant)
None/nothing	Sleep more
APFT	Chaos/confusion
Cadre/instructors	Blank
Chow/food	
Blank	

A similar search list was developed for OE3; the question at the very end of the survey that asked respondents to add any other comments they had about the WTC. After searching the word/phrase list, we determined that the answers were comprehensive and encompassed too much subject matter for N6 word/phrase searches to be effective at pulling out useful information. Therefore, we downloaded the OE3 comments to a text file. As such, it comprised a 55-page file.

Results. In presenting the results, we have combined some of the very similar content used in the analysis into smaller categories. The first item in Section 4 (Question 35) asked “*In your opinion, what are the three strongest features of the WTC?*” Of 1,317 Soldiers who took the survey, almost 80% provided some response. The results are presented in Table 26. Clearly, the three most predominant themes dealt with the personnel providing the training (19% of the respondents), followed by physical training (18%), and basic rifle marksmanship (14%). A significant percentage (10%) cited factors having to do with the length of the course – principally the fact that it was short, or only 4 weeks, or was not BCT.

Table 26. Responses – Three Strongest Features of WTC (n = 1,067)

Feature Cited	Percent
Instructors/cadre/DS	19.2
Physical training/APFT	17.8
Basic rifle marksmanship	14.0
Short length/4 weeks/not BCT	10.4
US weapons	5.3
Army Values	4.6
Discipline	4.0
Teamwork	3.8
Land navigation	3.6
Field training exercise	2.6
Warrior Challenge	2.6
None/Nothing	2.4
Respect	1.8
Hands-on	1.7
Food	1.4
Introduction course	1.3
Camaraderie	1.3
Military bearing	1.2
Refresher course	0.5

The second item (question 36) in Section 4 asked “*What recommendations would you make to improve WTC?*” Of the 1,317 Soldiers who took the survey, 85% provided some response to this item. The results are presented in Table 27. The dominant theme is that of respect and treatment – 23% of WTC Soldiers mentioned it as one of their main recommendations. This is followed closely (19%) by citations about instructors, principally the Drill Sergeants. Fourteen percent of Soldiers mentioned that a longer WTC course was warranted.

Table 27. Responses – Recommendations to Improve WTC (n = 1,119)

Content	Percent	Focus of Comments
Respect/treatment	22.8	want more respect, consideration for prior service, treatment as adults, yelling, cursing, demeaning treatment
Cadre/instructors/DS	19.1	mostly preferred cadre over Drill Sergeants, improve instructors
Length of course	14.0	want longer course
Organization/schedule	8.1	more/better organization, need for time management, adhere to schedule
More PT	6.5	schedule more, more practice
Recovery time/injuries	4.4	need more time to recover, adjust
Recruiters	3.6	need more/accurate information about WTC
Customs/courtesies	3.3	more instruction, not adequate for other services
Communication	2.6	need better communication between cadre, instructors, students, more info on schedule
Downtime/free time	1.4	need more personal time, admin time

Note. Totals do not equal 100% because of miscellaneous, unclassifiable responses.

It is of interest to compare the patterns of responses in the above two items. The first item was essentially “positive” (strongest features of WTC) while the second item was largely “negative” (recommendations to improve WTC). Yet some of the same themes appear in both (for example, cadre instructors and Drill Sergeants, length of course, physical training) but with different orientations. Presumably, the responses represented different groups within the survey audience with decidedly different perceptions and reactions. Although some of the responses may have changed over time or be in reaction to a specific circumstances or class situation²⁹, it also illustrates that the WTC Soldier population hardly constituted a homogeneous group in their views, reactions, and critical issues.

The final item on the survey was a general one, inviting the Soldier to make any comment about the WTC, even for topics not included in the survey. Soldiers were provided a half page to respond. About 474 Soldiers (36% of the survey population) provided some input. As was noted earlier, the open, unstructured nature of this item precluded a quantitative analysis as was done for the other two items. Many Soldiers provided extensive feedback, taking the time to write in detail and often supplementing what they had written with verbal feedback to the survey administrator. Many Soldiers felt very strongly about the issues that they identified and reacted with fervor and enthusiasm, bordering on passion. Many comments were detailed with supporting evidence and incidents. Some were specific as to ideas for change and improvement (e.g., diagnostic testing in all subject matter, grouping WTC Soldiers differently by abilities, and surveying other training courses) that are ideas worth further exploration.

The ARI On-Line WTC Survey

One issue of concern with the previously discussed end-of-course survey was that it was only available to WTC Soldiers starting with Class 007. There was unease over the fact that a

²⁹ For this condition, we did compare responses from different classes. Although some differences were noted they were not significant and did not alter the overall response patterns.

significant part of the WTC population would not be represented in the results. While these early WTC classes (001 through 006) had been represented in the 1-46th Infantry in-house survey (see Appendix B), the data from that survey were not compatible with that from the ARI survey. As a result, the decision was made to attempt to include this missing segment through means of an on-line version of the end-of-course survey.

An instrument was developed that very closely followed the content of the ARI survey located in Appendix D. There were some differences because of the on-line format and also some changes because of the post-WTC nature of the administration. The instrument was piloted and posted to an ARI website. A total of 576 former WTC Soldiers were identified who could be contacted through their Army Knowledge Online addresses. They were contacted by email and asked to cooperate in responding to the survey and directed to the website. The on-line survey ran from mid-July until about mid-September 2005. A total of 238 of those WTC Soldiers contacted responded by completing the survey, yielding a response rate of over 41%.

There were two areas of potential differences between the on-line survey audience and the end-of course-audience. First, the on-line audience was away from the WTC experience for four to nine months. Second, the on-line Soldier respondent was a volunteer participant, motivated by some unknown factors to provide input. However, an analysis of response patterns of the on-line group and comparison with the end-of-course group did not reveal any major overall differences. In fact, this was the primary use of the on-line data – to see if there were any discernable changes over time in Soldier reactions and outlooks between early WTC Soldiers and the later classes. Where appropriate, the on-line data were combined with the end-of-course data. A detailed separate break-out of the on-line results by individual survey item is contained in Appendix F.

Chapter 4. Findings and Recommendations

At the start of this study, there were four specific objectives identified to support the WTC assessment. These were:

1. Provide a detailed overview of the WTC program through the collection and analysis of performance, demographic, organizational, doctrinal, observation, and survey data.
2. Provide electronic databases of all survey data.
3. Conduct a comparative analysis of objective performance measures between WTC and BCT.
4. Provide assessment results to include recommendations for changes, improvements, and focus for continued analysis of the WTC program and policies.

The detailed overview is contained in the first three chapters of this report. The electronic databases have been prepared and submitted separately to ARI. The particulars about the database products are outlined under Database Development in Chapter 1. This chapter contains the findings and recommendations including those related to the comparative analysis between WTC and BCT. The ten findings are summarized below and presented in more detail in the remainder of this chapter:

1. Soldiers who attended the WTC were overwhelmingly made up of prior service with a considerable break in service, not direct transfers from the Navy or Air Force.
2. While there were many similarities between the WTC and BCT, the differences were more profound, precluding any meaningful comparison of Soldier performance.
3. Significant numbers of the WTC Soldiers expressed dissatisfaction with their treatment during the WTC.
4. Many Soldiers were not accurately informed about the realities of the WTC at enlistment.
5. The physical demand of the WTC was the single most predominant issue identified.
6. There was a consensus that the WTC was too short.
7. Although the WTC is not a leadership course, there was a concern about placing some WTC Soldiers in units without some leader development training.
8. Administrative issues detracted from the WTC training for some WTC Soldiers.
9. The role of Drill Sergeants in the WTC was controversial.
10. The WTC, and Soldier experiences, will change when the training is relocated.

The investigation and fact-gathering portion of this analysis essentially ended on 30 September 2005, before some very important implementation and administrative decisions were made. There may be findings and recommendations that are subsequently disputable because of unforeseen events at the time of writing. Readers need to update themselves on what is current in both B2G and the WTC. Nonetheless, for the most part, the results of this analysis will have applicability no matter what changes are made to the WTC in the immediate future.

Detailed Findings and Recommendations

This section details the findings that are reasonably supported by the observational and survey methods employed in the study. Of necessity in a analysis with limited time and resources, there is some qualification and stipulation included in the findings. Where appropriate, the finding is followed by a recommendation.

Finding 1: The WTC training audience. The premise of the B2G program and of the WTC training was that the preponderance of participants would be active duty Navy and Air Force transfers who enter WTC with no break in service, principally in the pay grades E2-E4. This was not the reality of the program. True B2G were a distinct minority at about 11% of the WTC population. Most WTC Soldiers were prior service personnel, including Army, who had a considerable break in service. About one-half the population was over 30 years of age and almost one-fifth were NCOs. About one-third of the Soldiers were combat/combat operations experienced. The range in ages, experience, ranks, and break in service was extreme. It was not the narrow training audience that was originally assumed. At least partly because of this diversity, there were differences in perception on the effectiveness and the appropriateness of the WTC training. This does not lead to a consequential conclusion that the content, focus, and emphasis of the course are necessarily not appropriate, but recognizes that the WTC training audience is different from original assumptions.

Recommendation: The WTC training content, training emphasis, and operational environment needs to be reexamined in light of what is known about the actual training audience.

Finding 2: Comparing the WTC and BCT. One of the directed efforts of the analysis was to answer whether the four week WTC was equal to the nine week BCT. While it was argued that the two courses were achieving different goals with different training populations, the overall conclusion was that they were not achieving comparable results. Direct comparable measures were few (APFT and weapons qualification) but on all measures, including subjective evaluations of trainers and commanders, all indicators were that the WTC training did not produce Soldiers at the same level as BCT. This also included the opinion of a significant number of Soldiers who experienced the WTC. Yet, in final analysis, the answer is more complex. For some Soldiers, the training and results from WTC probably were comparable to what they would have received in BCT, and for others, the differences are matters of degree or areas of disparity. With current information, it was not possible to quantitate the differences between the graduates of the two courses.

Finding 3: The WTC and Soldier reactions. There was strong indication that a significant number of Soldiers had major issues with their treatment in WTC. This is not universal – there were a larger number who do not have these issues or who were satisfied with their experience. And this was a difficult area – the WTC was a demanding, intense training course designed, at least in part, to prepare Soldiers for combat, and the standards of performance needed to be rigorous and evenly applied. Conflicts between trainers and trained are experienced in any setting. Yet the WTC training audience was both different and diverse from the normal BCT population and probably needed to be approached somewhat differently. As a group of older and more experienced adults, WTC Soldiers tended to have more fixed and set values and standards and were less tolerant of conditions that do not meet pre-established personal criteria and

expectations. The lack of accurate information about what to expect at the WTC also likely contributed to the dissatisfaction. Finally, even though many who had issues were those who tended to be more vocal about it, the rather pervasive extent of the dissatisfaction was of concern. Also of concern was the fact that dissatisfaction seemed fairly focused in the area of individual respect and treatment. The apprehension is that if these negative feelings interfere with the assimilation of the affected individuals into the Army culture and community, barriers to organizational cohesiveness could be erected, adversely affecting this group's later performance in the Army.

Recommendation: Policies need to be examined in the specific areas identified to see if adjustments can be made without sacrificing the overall rigor and discipline of the training. Attitudes and outlooks should continue to be monitored from future WTC classes using current data as a baseline.

Finding 4: Expectations about the WTC. Before arrival, the WTC was widely perceived by enlistees as a "gentleman's" course, conducted in an atmosphere similar to the Basic Non-commissioned Officer's Course in which trainees have Phase V+ privileges, and instructors use small group instruction and a teach, coach, mentor approach. This description comes from a variety of Army briefing materials and news releases and was widely disseminated by Army recruiters. The reality of the WTC was somewhat different - it was more like BCT than not. This analysis draws no conclusions about the appropriateness of the BCT-like approach – that is an Army policy decision and is best made by those conducting the training. However, when expectations and realities do not coincide, notable and even extreme dissatisfaction with the training can occur. That is evident in the WTC survey results.

Recommendation: Army information about the WTC needs to be correct and reflect the realities of the course. It is particularly important that Army websites and recruiters have and relay accurate information to enlistees. Because much of the information possessed by recruiters appeared to be persistently incorrect, this needs to be a subject of special attention in orienting Army recruiters about the WTC program.

Finding 5: Physical demands of the WTC: The physical demands of the WTC training, to include APFT requirements, were the single most prominent issue of the course among both WTC Soldiers and cadre. Injuries and illnesses related to physical demands appear to have been widespread and were likely higher than comparable BCT experiences. There appeared to be a number of causative factors including age and condition of the population, length of the course, Soldier expectations and pre-conditioning, misinformation prior to the course, and the physical nature of the training. Consequences were serious including recycles, increased sick call, training time loss, and at least some cases of persistent and chronic injuries and conditions that could affect Soldier's subsequent careers and contribution to the Army.

Recommendation: Foremost, WTC Soldiers need to have adequate pre-attendance information on the physical requirements of the course, including a suggested regimen of preparation. This needs to come primarily through recruiters. A pre-WTC APFT screen should be administered prior to assignment to a class with a cut-off high enough so that APFT success within the course length is attainable. Finally, medical personnel should study the injury/illness

records, the characteristics of the population, and the practices and requirements of the course to see if adjustments are needed in the conditioning and physical demand practices of the training.

Finding 6: Length of the WTC. The WTC course was 29 days from start to graduation. By many indications, this time was insufficient. Cadre and course administrators were adamant in their requirement for more time and a significant proportion of the WTC Soldiers also thought the course should be longer. Many problems, including physical training and physical recovery, were related to the current course length. Problems were encountered in qualifying Soldiers in the abbreviated BRM. Cadre cited inadequate time devoted to a number of training blocks (e.g., weapons, convoy operations). As conducted, there was little flexibility in the course scheduling to adjust for holidays, make-ups, and inclement weather or facilities conflicts. There was also a lack of administrative time periodically throughout the course to take care of non-training requirements.

Recommendation: The length of the course needs to be reexamined. A one week addition was the recommendation of many cadre, but the length and what to change in the POI should be part of an overall review and reassessment of the WTC training curriculum.

Finding 7: The WTC and leadership preparation. Almost 55% of the WTC population were NCOs or were E4s who would, presumably before too long, be moved into leadership positions. But the WTC was not intended to be a leadership course, and it is doubtful if it could conduct effective leadership skills training under the current course structure. The leadership issue was even more acute for this group because most of the B2G population was from other services where leadership styles are different. There was much anecdotal evidence that many in the WTC were not sufficiently prepared to assume NCO roles in the Army, but in fact, the extent of the problem or the exact issues are unknown. Confounding the matter is that leadership issues, as with other WTC training concerns, will not be fully known until the WTC Soldier has spent some time with his or her unit.

Recommendation: Suggested solutions have ranged from incorporating leader positions into the WTC class structure to having WTC NCOs attend the Warrior Leader Course before their first unit assignment. However, the first effort should be to define the problem. There should be an undertaking to conduct a longitudinal examination of WTC graduates to assess how they fit and function in the Army. This evaluation would include the leadership issue.

Finding 8: The WTC and personnel/administrative issues. There is no indication that serious personnel issues (pay, leave, housing, dependent care) were widespread in the WTC, but they did occur and when they happened they both detracted from WTC training and tended to be persistent beyond WTC. The WTC population was older, married, and more likely to have dependents. Moreover, there are some unique problems and issues that affect the True B2G that many personnel specialists simply do not have experience resolving (e.g., leave, date of rank, performance ratings). It is axiomatic that when a trainee has an issue that affects his or her family, that is where attention will be and not on their training. The shortness of the WTC period often defied resolution of many of the problems during WTC which usually meant that the Soldier had to start from the beginning again at their next duty station. There was also an indication (and a perception) that rank adjustments for prior service personnel (particularly PS Army) were being unevenly applied.

Recommendation: Enough experience now exists with B2G and WTC personnel problems that these should be thoroughly documented and passed along as lessons learned to Human Resources commanders, recruiters, and even new B2G enlistees. It is essential that the 1-515th RTI have procedures and support in place to deal with these out-of-routine problems when the WTC is passed to their control. Policies on rank adjustments need to be verified and reinforced at the point of Soldier entry.

Finding 9: The WTC and Drill Sergeants. A predominant and controversial issue in the WTC was the presence and roles of Drill Sergeants in the course. As instructors, Drill Sergeants are specially selected, screened, and go through an extensive 9-week training period before becoming qualified. They are recognized as both highly motivated and professional. Yet, there is a legitimate concern that after extensive time "on the trail," Drill Sergeants can develop issues. The policy is to limit Drill Sergeant tours to 24 months (although extensions to 36 months are common), recognizing the high demands and stress put on these individuals. Drill Sergeants are exclusively assigned to IET; training in the Non-commissioned Officer Education System courses is not conducted by Drill Sergeants. The Drill Sergeants who taught in the WTC were primarily BCT instructors, working with BCT Soldiers the majority of their time and with at most one or two WTC classes a year. That they brought with them a "BCT approach" was not surprising. Most saw this as an advantage; the outgoing WTC Battalion Commander saw the loss of Drill Sergeants as a serious impediment to the success of the course. WTC Soldiers themselves were divided – many vehemently felt being taught by Drill Sergeants was a problem while others felt that Drill Sergeants as instructors and cadre were strengths of the program. However, there was little doubt that Drill Sergeants affected the whole tenor of the WTC.

There is no conclusive or preponderance of evidence that Drill Sergeants are either required for the WTC, nor is there similar substantiation to make the case that they should not be involved. Ultimately it would appear that the decision will be made by external factors – when taught under the 1-46th Infantry, the manpower resource for conducting the WTC was Drill Sergeants. When taught by the 1-515th RTI, they will not be resourced with Drill Sergeants.

Finding 10: Future of the WTC – Transfer of program. At the close of this study, the timing of transferring the WTC from Fort Knox to a probable location in New Mexico and to the NMARNG was still being debated. However, that transfer was still the stated long-term objective. When that occurs, the impact on the WTC will likely be extensive. The move will not only be physical, but the transfer of implementation and training responsibility from 1-46th Infantry to 1-515th RTI will affect many facets of the conduct of the WTC and could alter the entire WTC experience. The observations and findings of this analysis were specific to the WTC as conducted in the Fort Knox environment. It is not anticipated that they will be completely generalizable to a changed environment.

Recommendation: The analysis and evaluation of the WTC should continue under changed conditions. The current analysis results and data should serve as a baseline for this continued effort.

Summary

The overall conclusion is that WTC was an effective program that has been successful in transitioning more than 2,000 prior service Soldiers into the Army. While the WTC long term effectiveness can only be determined after these Soldiers have been assimilated into their units, the training does appear to be doing what it was designed to do. That said, there were areas that could be improved and other areas where trends and indicators were identified that provide focus for monitoring, correction, and change.

A criticism of most studies is that the investigators' invariable recommendation is "more study." Yet, in the case of the WTC, that conclusion is certainly warranted. Because the program not only has evolved with each iteration but also because the WTC Soldier population seems to be changing, the analysis that has been completed serves principally to point to areas that need more concentrated follow-up, sometimes by specialized personnel such as medical or training staff. In particular, the survey data have provided sound baseline data, but the successful training programs are those that never cease to critically evaluate themselves.

References

American Forces Press Service (2004). Pentagon launches 'operation blue to green'. News release July 28.

Army News Service (2005). PLDC changes to warrior leader course. (News Release October 16, 2005).

Campbell, R.C. (2005). *Warrior transition course assessment (WTC-A) research execution plan*. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Courtney Hixson Army News Service (2004). Operation blue to green. News release July 27.

Department of the Army (1987). *Army regulation 600-9 the Army weight control program*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC: Headquarters, Author

Department of the Army (2003a). *FM 3-22.9 rifle marksmanship M16A1, M16A2/3, M16A4 and M4 carbine*. Washington, DC: Author.

Department of the Army (2003b). *Army regulation 635-200 personnel separations: Active duty enlisted separations*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC: Headquarters, Author.

Department of the Army (2004). *TRADOC Warrior transition course implementation plan*. (Memorandum September 10 2004). Unpublished manuscript.

Department of the Army (2005a) *Army regulation 601-210 Regular Army and Army Reserve enlistment program*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC: Headquarters, Author.

Department of the Army (2005b). *Army regulation 40-501 standards of medical fitness*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC: Headquarters, Author.

Department of Defense (2003). *Population representation in the military services*. Retrieved November 10, 2005 from <http://www.dodmil/prhomepopprep2002/>.

Department of Defense (2004). Pentagon launches 'operation blue to green.' (Press release American Forces Information Service). *American Forces Press Service*.

Headquarters 1-46th Infantry Battalion (2005). *Situation report class 12*. Unpublished manuscript.

Larson, J. C. (LTC) (2005). *Warrior transition course (WTC) after action review (AAR)*. Memorandum for Record. Unpublished manuscript.

National Guard Bureau In Process Review-New Mexico Courses of Action (2005). Briefing slides. Briefing 23 June 2005.

Request for ARI Research-Based Personnel and Training Study or Analysis (2004). Memorandum. Unpublished manuscript

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

U.S. Army Infantry School (2004). *Program of instruction warrior transition course*. Fort Benning, GA: Author.

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (2004). *Warrior transition course (WTC) assessment working study plan*. Arlington, VA: Author.

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (2005). *Statement of task warrior transition course (WTC) assessment*. Arlington, VA: Author.

U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (2005a). *EXSUM 15-18 August 2005 IET Brigade Commander/CSM Conference*. (Executive summary conference results). Unpublished manuscript.

U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (2005b). *TRADOC regulation 350-6 enlisted initial entry training (IET) policies and administration*. Fort Monroe, VA: Author.

Warrior Transition Course Culture. Briefing Slides. Retrieved March 8, 2005 from <http://www.knox.army.mil/school/latb/index.htm>.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Appendix A

Acronyms and Abbreviations

The following are a list of the acronyms and abbreviations as used in the body of this report.

AIT – advanced individual training

APFT – Army Physical Fitness Test

ARI – United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

ATB – Armor Training Brigade

BCT – basic combat training

BRM – basic rifle marksmanship

B2G – Blue to Green

E - enlisted

e.g. – exempli gratia (for example)

FY – fiscal year

IET – initial entry training

M – model

MOS – military occupational specialty

n – number

NCO – non-commissioned officer

NMARNG – New Mexico Army National Guard

NPS – non-prior service

NUD*IST – non-numerical unstructured data – indexing, searching, and theorizing

OSUT – One Station Unit Training

POI – program of instruction

PS – prior service

ROTC – Reserve Officer Training Corps

RTI – Regional Training Institute

TRADOC – United States Army Training and Doctrine Command

U.S. – United States

WTC – Warrior Transition Course

Appendix B

Pre-Existing WTC Survey

The following is the 16-item survey that was administered to WTC Classes 001 through 004. This survey was developed internally by training personnel from 1-46th Infantry. A subjective description of the results of a response analysis is included after each question. There were 316 surveys analyzed.

1. What was your motivation for joining/rejoining the Army?

By far, the most frequently listed response centered on Service to the Country. Additional, but less frequent reasons included (a) the continuation or acquisition of benefits (medical, housing, education, pay) and (b) completing sufficient service to be eligible for retirement.

2. Do you feel you were adequately prepared for this course? If not, in what areas were you not prepared?

The majority (over one-half) responded "no" to the first part of the question. The predominant issue cited was physical training or the physical demands of the course. Other responses centered on course expectations. The two next most predominant were (a) that the recruiter either mislead or did not have accurate information about what the course would be like, and (b) related to (a), that the expectation was for an easier course or at least not a BCT course.

3. What advice would you give students preparing to attend the Warrior Transition Course?

There were two themes that dominated, almost equally: the advice to be prepared physically and the advice to get as much accurate information about the course as possible. Next most frequent response centered on attitudes – to stay focused and to do what you are told. A final, lesser, theme pertained to having one's personal affairs in order.

4. Were you given a PT test prior to coming to this course? If no, do you feel you were in adequate physical shape for this course?

This was a difficult item to analyze because the structure of the question does not reflect the reality of most experiences. In summary, the majority of attendees were given some type of physical conditioning test before starting the WTC – by the recruiter, at the MEPS, or at the Reception Battalion prior to shipping over to the WTC. However, many indicated that they took a "modified" PT test (for example, involving a 1 mile run), or that the test was administered very informally. Many expressed the information that although they took and "passed" whatever it was that was given for a PT test, it did not adequately prepare them for or reflect the requirements of, the WTC.

5. Rank-order the following training events 1 to 5, 1 being hardest, 5 being easiest.
 (Shown from hardest to easiest)

APFT – mean=2.83

FTX – mean=3.02

BRM – mean=3.08

Footmarches – mean=3.04

Land Navigation – mean=3.26

6. Rate how often you experienced each of the following and your level of stress with the situations listed below. (Percentages shown)

Condition	None	Frequency Few Times	Very Often	None	Stress Some	Quite a Bit
Too much information too quickly	21.3	63.8	15.0	44.9	48.0	7.1
Not knowing what is going on around me	12.7	53.2	34.1	28.6	51.6	19.8
Facing a problem with no clear correct answer	12.7	61.9	25.4	31.8	52.4	15.9
Being pressed for time	4.7	30.5	64.8	27.3	44.5	28.1
Having nothing to do	46.0	46.0	8.0	65.9	26.2	7.9
Not knowing what will happen next	9.6	45.6	44.8	39.2	42.4	18.4
Being asked to make a decision quickly	20.8	62.4	16.8	49.6	45.6	4.8
Being told you are not thinking clearly	47.2	44.0	8.8	61.6	29.6	8.8
Verbal threats of injury or pain	57.3	34.7	8.1	72.6	21.0	6.5
Loss of something precious	87.9	9.7	2.4	82.3	12.1	5.6
Anger towards peers or instructors	29.4	50.8	19.8	43.7	43.7	12.6
Divided loyalties/ Conflicting priorities	35.7	50.8	13.5	51.6	41.3	7.1
Being put in a leadership position	23.8	60.3	15.9	50.8	45.3	3.9
Illness	45.2	50.0	4.9	62.1	29.8	8.1
Lack of sleep	17.5	50.8	31.8	44.4	42.1	13.5
Thirst	48.4	44.4	7.1	78.6	19.1	2.3
Hunger	52.4	38.1	9.5	78.6	19.1	2.3
Sore muscles	7.9	52.4	39.7	45.2	43.7	11.1

n = ~300

7. Do you feel your instructors were fair and motivated to develop you into the best soldier you could be?

The majority response was a straight "Yes." However, a number answered "yes" with some qualification or additional information. Generally, these responses included qualifiers such as "except for sometimes," or "some instructors less qualified in some particular areas."

8. Who would you nominate as the best instructor of the cycle and why?

(Individuals were named – data not analyzed.)

9. Please rate how well you think you could perform the following tasks in a training environment or in combat? (3 choices were provided: I could not do; I could meet standard; I could exceed standard. There were no significantly different patterns for training or combat so a single response is shown. Shown are the percent who indicated they could either meet or exceed standard. Tasks are ordered from lowest to highest.)

Task	% Meet or Exceed Standard
Use M8/M9 paper to identify a chemical agent	65.9
Decontaminate my skin	76.1
Send a SALUTE report	76.8
Administer nerve agent antidote to self	81.9
Administer nerve agent antidote to another soldier	84.1
Establish an OP	84.8
Treat burns	86.2
Initiate an ambush	86.2
React to enemy sniper	87.0
Prevent shock	88.4
React to civilians on the battlefield	88.4
Engage target with an M203 grenade launcher	89.4
Employ an M18 Claymore mine	89.9
Navigate cross-country	90.6
Don the protective mask	90.8
React to an ambush	91.2
Maintain a protective mask	92.0
Engage target with an M249 SAW	92.0
Clear a malfunction on an M249 SAW	92.0
React to media	92.3
Engage target with a hand grenade	92.8
React to artillery	92.8
Construct a fighting position	92.8
Load and unload an M249 SAW	93.4
Splint a fracture	93.5
Evacuate a wounded soldier	93.5
Engage a target with an AT-4 anti tank	93.5
Camouflage yourself and your position	93.5
Restore breathing	94.2
Fire at and hit stationary target with an M16	94.2
Move while under direct fire	94.2
Secure a perimeter	94.2
Challenge persons entering area	94.2
Conduct a roadmarch	94.9
Practice noise, light, and litter discipline	94.9
Evacuate a casualty	95.7
Stop bleeding	95.7

10. Do you feel prepared to start AIT or enter the Army? If not, in what areas do you feel you need additional training?

Overwhelmingly, the answer to the first part of this question was “Yes.” However, there were some differences by prior service component (where that component could be identified by other information volunteered in the questionnaire). PS-Army tended to give unqualified “yes” responses. As expected, the responses of AF and Navy PS were less positive – either a “No” but more often a “Don’t Know,” or a “Yes, but.... .” Respondents who don’t answer just “Yes” provide very little specific information in response to the second part of the question – just a feeling that they are “not ready” without being able to identify the specifics of not being ready. Clearly, the implication is that they are still apprehensive of what to expect in the Army.

11. What was the best training event?

There were only nine training events that were listed at all, although some respondents indicated that they could not pick any one event. The top training event identified was the Warrior Challenge. The other three in the top four were (2) FTX, (3) BRM, (4) Land Navigation. Also runs, but getting mentions, were (a) US Weapons Familiarization (b) Urban Operations, (c) Hand-to-Hand (d) Pugil Stick, and (e) Hand Grenades. No other events were even mentioned.

12. What event could use improvement and how would you suggest improving it?

This was very difficult to analyze as there were so many different responses. Physical training was certainly a frequently mentioned event with suggestions including “more, more often” and breaking WTC Soldiers out by ability groups. Recovery time was an issue but this seemed to be limited to a small group that seemed to identify themselves as “older.” There were some suggestions for more BRM. And a significant number identified the need for more “realistic” training in FTX and Urban Operations. These suggestions included more obstacles, mines and booby traps, room clearing and the requirement for a more skilled, consistent and realistic opposition forces (OPFOR).

13. What aspects of the course would you keep the same?

This item also had mostly diverse responses with a lot of areas identified. If there was one thread however, it would have to center around the FTX and tactical operations exercise and training.

14. If there was one thing you could change about the course, what would it be?

Naturally, there were a lot of different responses to this very general question. In no order of priority, the majority of responses included the following themes: (a) need more personnel freedom and time off to do things like get haircuts, shine boots, prep uniforms, (b) not using Drill Sergeants as instructors (c) change physical training (although no common theme – some want more, some less, some different) and (d) a concern at being treated throughout the course as basic trainees.

15. What is the biggest difference between your past branch of service and the Army? (If prior service Army, do not answer.)

A great variety in responses and sometimes conflicting – some identified the Army as having more pride, tradition, and *esprit de corps* and some [Marines identifiably] as the Army having less of these qualities. “Customs and courtesies” was probably the most frequently mentioned theme. Another frequent theme was the difference in NCOs – their authority and responsibility. This is probably a significant theme of those who hold NCO rank from another service.

16. Any additional comments/suggestions:

As a catch-all question, there were a lot of different responses. Also, there is a lot of overlap in responses here and those given in Question #14. Those respondents who did provide input to this question were usually pretty vehement in their opinions. Some themes:

- a. Extend the course by two weeks.
- b. Feel rushed and pushed and “not ready.” This was most prevalent in responses from other services and especially by those from other services in higher ranks (E4 and above).
- c. Recruiters do not have a realistic picture of what the WTC course is like and are not conveying accurate information. There is a lot of confusion on what to bring/not to bring to the course.
- d. Personal issues (family, pay, leave). These are not frequent but when they occur, they are all-consuming for the individual, virtually obliterating anything else about the training.
- e. The amount of time sitting around and doing nothing at training events, particularly at ranges. This was a universal theme, regardless of prior service component or any other factor. Specific criticism focused on training at Company level when the facilities can only handle half that number – the rest have to just sit and wait. A feeling of frustration, boredom, and wasted time.

Appendix C

WTC Supervisor Interview Protocols

This appendix contains the protocols that were developed to guide the discussions in the follow-up interview with the supervisors of WTC graduates. They are intended as general guides to stimulate discussion and input, rather than typifying categories of data to be gathered.

Verbal Brief:

I am _____ from HumRRO representing the Army Research Institute. We are involved in a study evaluating the Army's Warrior Transition Course (WTC) which is a 4 week orientation course that supports the Army's Blue to Green (B2G) Program. Under this program, members of other Services (Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps) can enlist directly in the Army at their existing rank. The program also takes in prior service persons from all of the Services, including the Army.

As part of our evaluation, we are interested in tracking some selected WTC Soldiers after their training. This includes talking with their supervisors in their units.

You have been identified as the supervisor of _____. I would like to get your informal appraisal of _____ performance since you have been his/her supervisor. This is not a formal evaluation – I will be asking you a series of questions, but feel free to offer your own input.

Let me assure you that this is for purposes of general feedback only. None of what you tell me will be attributed to you or attached to _____ by name. None of what you tell me will be given back to _____. Your comments to me will not affect _____. However, they will help us identify both strong and weak points in the B2G and WTC training program and they are very important. I urge you to be candid.

WTC Supervisor Discussion Guide

WTC Soldier Name, Current Rank _____

MOS _____ Duty Position or Job Assignment _____

How long in unit? _____ How long have you known/supervised this Soldier? _____

Did you know this Soldier was part of the Army B2G program? _____

Compare this Soldier to other Soldiers in same grade and MOS that you have known or supervised. In each of the following areas, rate the Soldier's skill or performance according to following scale:

A= Performs above the average of similar Soldiers

E= Performs generally about equal to similar Soldiers

B= Performs below the average of similar Soldiers

U= Cannot rate; have not really observed this skill/performance in this Soldier

(NOTE: Encourage the supervisor to expand or to give examples.)

1. Technical job or MOS skills _____
2. Common Soldier Skills (weapons, NBC, land nav, commo, first aid, etc) _____
3. Army customs, courtesies, traditions _____
4. The Seven Army Values and Warrior Ethos _____
5. Leadership (supervising, training, leading others) _____
6. Physical training (PT) and physical performance _____

Has this Soldier had any administrative problems or issues from their prior service such as pay, rank, leave accumulation, bonus payments, family, housing, or medical issues that you know of? _____

Do you have any knowledge or impressions of the Warrior Transition Course (WTC) from talking to or supervising this Soldier? ____ If yes, explain _____

How does this Soldier interact with his or her fellow Soldiers? Are they accepted and do they fit well in the unit?

What are this Soldier's Strong Areas? _____

In what areas does this Soldier need improvement? _____

Would you recommend this Soldier for promotion to the next higher pay grade? _____. If not now, when, or under what conditions? _____

(Or, has this Soldier been promoted since assignment to the unit?)

Any problems or additional comments you wish to add?

Appendix D

ARI End-of-Course Survey

This survey was administered to approximately 1290 Soldiers in WTC Classes 007 through 015. The content matches the ARI on-line survey that was administered to an additional 238 WTC Soldiers who had graduated from WTC Classes 001 through 006. The ARI control number for this instrument is Personnel Test (PT): 60-78/MAR 05



THE WARRIOR TRANSITION COURSE (WTC) SURVEY

WHY THIS SURVEY?

The purpose of the 2005 Warrior Transition Course (WTC) Survey is to collect information from current WTC students on their assessment of the WTC and their perceptions of their WTC experience.

WHY SHOULD I PARTICIPATE?

The Army training leadership wants to know if the WTC is meeting the transition needs of former Air Force and Navy service personnel who enlist in the Army through the Operation Blue-To-Green (B2G) program. The leadership also wants to know if the WTC is meeting the transition needs of prior service (PS) Soldiers who re-enter the Army. The primary goal of the WTC is to quickly develop these former Airmen, Sailors, and PS Soldiers into well-disciplined, highly-motivated, physically fit Soldiers who are prepared for advanced individual training (AIT), a unit assignment, or one station unit training (OSUT), and who accept the Army's core seven values and adopt the Warrior Ethos.

The 2005 Warrior Transition Course Survey is sponsored by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). The Selection and Assignment Unit (SARU) of the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences is conducting the survey and will be responsible for the distribution of the its results and findings.

We encourage you to use the "COMMENTS" section to provide additional information and tell us about WTC matters/issues important to you.

WILL I BE IDENTIFIED?

Your responses to the survey will not be tracked back to you. Only persons involved in collecting or preparing the information for analysis of the data will have access to the completed surveys. Only group statistics will be reported.

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

- This is not a test, so take your time.
- Select answers you believe are most appropriate.
- Please PRINT where applicable.
- Blacken the appropriate circle to indicate your answer.

To change an answer, completely erase the answer you want to change and blacken the correct circle.

SECTION 1: THE WTC AND YOU

1. How did you first learn about the WTC? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

- U.S. Army recruiter
- Recruiter from my prior service
- Internet sources
- Installation/post newspaper
- From former WTC Soldiers
- I did not learn about the WTC; I reported for 9-weeks of Basic Combat Training (BCT), but was then told to report to the WTC.
- Other (please explain)

2. If you learned about the WTC from a military recruiter, how knowledgeable was that recruiter on the detailed aspects of the WTC? MARK ONE.

- Not applicable; did not learn about WTC from a military recruiter
- Not at all knowledgeable
- Somewhat knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable

3. Based on the information you had about the WTC prior to arriving at Ft. Knox, did you expect that ... MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

- I did not have any expectations; being placed in the WTC was a surprise to me. → SKIP TO NEXT QUESTION

Expected	Did not expect
	OO

this would be an Army "gentleman's" course

OO

this would be an Army "introductory" course

OO

this would be a "transition" course

OO

for me to learn Army values, customs and courtesies

OO

there would be strenuous physical fitness

OO

requirements

OO

I would go through basic combat training

OO

(BCT)

OO

I would be taught by Drill Sergeants

OO

4. During WTC training, did you suffer from any illness or injuries including stress related muscle or joint injuries? MARK ONE.

- Yes, and I went on sick call
- Yes, but I did not go on sick call
- No

5. Please use the following scale to rate your WTC INSTRUCTORS as a group. MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

Very good	
Good	
Fair	
Poor	
Very poor	

Sets high standards for Soldiers in terms of good order and discipline
Sets good examples by behaving the way they expect Soldiers to behave
Enforces standards they set for good behavior
Overall leadership effectiveness
Demonstrates technical competence
Treats WTC students with respect
Demonstrates Army values
Instills commitment to selfless service
Provides support and encouragement
Provides feedback on your training
Helps develop your skills/competencies
Respects your prior military experience and the job skills that you brought to the WTC

OOOOO

8. For each WTC training event, do you think the amount of time allotted for each event was too short, just right, or too long? MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

Too long	
Just right	
Too short	

Physical Training	OOOO
Basic Rifle Marksmanship	OOOO
Land Navigation	OOOO
Drill & Ceremony (D&C)	OOOO
Army Customs & Courtesy	OOOO
First Aid	OOOO
Tactical Footmarches	OOOO
Army Organization & Orientation	OOOO
Squad External Evaluation (EXEVAL)	OOOO

9. Looking back on your experience in the WTC, which training course do you believe is best to meet the training needs of incoming Soldiers? MARK ONE.

4 week WTC
 9 week basic combat training (BCT)

10. What is your assignment upon your WTC graduation? MARK ONE.

Advanced Individual Training (AIT)
 An Active duty unit assignment
 A Reserve duty assignment
 One Station Unit Training (OSUT)
 Other training or schooling
 Don't know/not sure
 Other (please explain)

11. If you indicated that you are being assigned to a unit, based on what you know now about this unit, what is the likelihood that you will deploy to any of the following locations within 0-3 months of your WTC training? MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

Not applicable; I am not going to a unit assignment.

Very likely	
Likely	
Neither likely nor unlikely	
Unlikely	
Very unlikely	

To Afghanistan	OOOOO
To Iraq	OOOOO
To elsewhere in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)	OOOOO
To other OCONUS site not listed above	OOOOO

12. Overall, how confident are you that the WTC has prepared you to succeed in your next duty assignment? MARK ONE.

Very confident
 Confident
 Somewhat confident
 Not at all confident
 Not sure

13. Will you recommend the WTC to others? MARK ONE.

Definitely yes
 Probably yes
 Probably no
 Definitely no
 Don't know

14. Overall, how satisfied are you with your WTC experience? MARK ONE.

Very satisfied
 Satisfied
 Neutral or mixed feelings
 Dissatisfied
 Very dissatisfied

SECTION 2: THE ARMY AND YOU

> For the next set of questions we would like for you to shift your thinking from your particular experiences in the WTC to your future career in the Army.

15. How important were each of the following reasons for joining/rejoining the Army? MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

Extremely important
Very important
Important
Somewhat important
Not at all important

Help fight the War on Terrorism	
Serve country	
Experience military life	
Career opportunities/advancement	
Training opportunities	
Educational opportunities	
Pay & benefits	
Family support	
To finish remaining years for retirement	
Opportunity to travel	
Lack of advancement in prior service	
Could not stay in prior service	
(Please explain below)	_____

16. If your prior service was any service OTHER than the Army, to what extent were the following incentives influential in your decision to join the Army and attend the WTC? MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

Not applicable; my prior service was Army
 Not applicable; I did not know about the WTC incentives

Very great extent

Great extent

Moderate extent

Some extent

Little or no extent

Ability to maintain prior rank	
Ability to maintain military benefits	
Ability to maintain MOS	
4 weeks of training instead of 9 weeks of basic training	

17. To what extent do you agree that the Army is obligated to provide each of the following to you? MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

Strongly agree

Agree

Undecided

Disagree

Strongly disagree

An attractive benefits package	
Fair treatment	
A relatively secure job	
Feedback on your performance	
Training	
Leadership and direction	
Opportunities for career development	
within the Army	
Opportunities to use your skills and capacities	
A good atmosphere at work	
Respect for your personal situation	
Opportunities for flexible working hours	
depending on your personal needs	
Positive relationships between colleagues	
Opportunities to show what you can do	

18. To what extent do you agree that you are obligated to provide each of the following to the Army? MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

	Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree	
Volunteer to do tasks that fall outside your job description	OOOOO	
Perform your job in a reliable manner	OOOOO	
Deal honestly with the Army	OOOOO	
Work extra hours if needed to get the job done	OOOOO	
Develop new skills as needed	OOOOO	
Cooperate well with your colleagues	OOOOO	
Assist your colleagues with their work	OOOOO	
Use the organization's properties honestly	OOOOO	
Take personal initiative to attend training courses	OOOOO	
Remain with the Army for at least some years	OOOOO	
Get along well with your colleagues	OOOOO	
Follow the policies and norms of the Army	OOOOO	

19. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? MARK A RESPONSE FOR EACH.

	Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree	
I feel like a part of the family in the Army	OOOOO	
The Army has a great deal of personal meaning for me	OOOOO	
I feel a strong sense of belonging to the Army	OOOOO	
I feel emotionally attached to the Army	OOOOO	
It would be too costly for me to leave the Army in the near future	OOOOO	
I am afraid of what might happen if I quit the Army without having another job lined up	OOOOO	
Too much of my life would be interrupted if I decided I wanted to leave the Army now	OOOOO	
One of the problems with leaving the Army would be lack of available alternatives	OOOOO	
I do not feel any obligation to remain with the Army	OOOOO	
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave the Army right now	OOOOO	
I would feel guilty if I left the Army now	OOOOO	
The Army deserves my loyalty	OOOOO	
I would not leave the Army right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	OOOOO	
I owe a great deal to the Army	OOOOO	

20. How important is each of the following to you personally? MARK ONE FOR EACH.

	Extremely important Very important Important Somewhat important Not at all important	
Loyalty to the U.S. Army	OOOOO	
Loyalty to your unit or organization	OOOOO	
Taking responsibility for your actions and decisions	OOOOO	
Putting what is good for your fellow Soldiers, unit, and the nation before your own welfare	OOOOO	
Dedication to serving the United States, even to risking your life in its defense	OOOOO	
Commitment to working as a member of a team	OOOOO	
Dedication to learning your job and doing it well	OOOOO	
Personal drive to succeed in your work and advance	OOOOO	
Being honest, open and truthful	OOOOO	
Being disciplined and courageous in battle	OOOOO	
Standing up for what you firmly believe is right	OOOOO	
Working with others tactfully and with military courtesy	OOOOO	
Exhibiting excellent military bearing and appearance	OOOOO	
High moral standards both on-duty and off-duty	OOOOO	
Building and maintaining physical fitness and stamina	OOOOO	

SECTION 3: YOUR BACKGROUND

21. Are you female or male? MARK ONE.

- Female
- Male

22. Are you of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin or ancestry (of any race)? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

- No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry
- Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
- Yes, Puerto Rican
- Yes, Cuban
- Yes, other Hispanic/Spanish

23. What is your race? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

- American Indian or Alaska Native (e.g., Eskimo, Aleut)
- Asian (e.g., Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese)
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (e.g., Samoan, Guamanian, Chamorro)
- White

24. What is the highest level of education you have completed? MARK ONE.

- Less than high school, but no diploma, certificate, or GED
- High school completed with diploma or GED
- Vocational/technical school graduate
- Some college
- Bachelor's degree
- Some graduate school
- Master's degree or equivalent
- Doctorate degree or professional degree, such as MD, DDS, JD

25. In what year were you born?

19_____

26. What is your current marital status? MARK ONE.

- Single
- Married
- Legally separated
- Divorced

27. What was the last service you belonged to prior to your current enlistment in the Army? MARK ONE.

- Active Duty Army
- Army Reserve
- Army National Guard
- Active Duty Air Force
- Air Force Reserve
- Air National Guard
- Active Duty Navy
- Navy Reserve
- Active Duty Marines
- Marines Reserve
- Active Duty Coast Guard
- Coast Guard Reserve
- Other (please explain) _____

28. What was your highest rank prior to joining the Army? MARK ONE.

- E1
- E2
- E3
- E4
- E5
- E6
- E7
- E8
- E9

29. What is your current rank in the Army? MARK ONE.

- PV1 (E1)
- PV2 (E2)
- PFC (E3)
- CPL/SPC (E4)
- SGT (E5)
- SSG (E6)

30. What was your prior Military Occupational Specialty (MOS), Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC), or Rating? PLEASE PRINT YOUR ANSWER.

MOS: _____

AFSC: _____

Rating: _____

31. What is your current MOS? PLEASE PRINT YOUR ANSWER.

MOS: _____

32. During the past 3 months, which of the following BEST DESCRIBES what you were doing prior to joining/rejoining the Army? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

- Full time student
- Part-time student
- Working full time as a civilian
- Working part-time as a civilian
- Unemployed
- Full time homemaker
- Active duty military
- Reserve duty military
- Other (please explain) _____

33. At the present time, what are your Army career plans? MARK ONE.

- To stay in the Army until retirement
- To stay in the Army beyond my present obligation, but not necessarily to retirement
- To leave the Army upon completion of my present obligation
- To leave the Army before completion of my present obligation

34. Please print your social security number in the boxes below.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

[NOTE: Use of social security numbers is authorized by Executive Order 9397. Only persons involved in collecting or preparing the information for analysis will have access to completed surveys. Only group statistics will be reported.]

SECTION 4: COMMENTS

35. In your opinion, what are the three strongest features of the WTC? PLEASE PRINT.

36. What recommendations would you make to improve the WTC? PLEASE PRINT.

A

We are interested in any other comments you may have about the WTC, even if the topic was not covered in this survey. If you would like to make any additional comments please write them in the space below or attach a separate sheet of paper. If applicable, please indicate the question number to which your comment is related.

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

Appendix E

Results of ARI End of Course Survey

In this appendix are the detailed responses from the ARI End of Course Survey for the 29 items for which quantitative input was obtained. The questions correspond to the sample survey instrument in Appendix C. These responses are from 1289 Soldiers who attended WTC Classes 007 through 015. The ARI control number for this instrument is PT: 60-78/MAR 05.

SECTION 1: THE WTC AND YOU

Question 1. How did you first learn about the WTC? (n=1289)

Responses	Percent
U.S. Army Recruiter	76.0
Other	13.3
Internet sources	11.3
Installations/post newspaper	3.5
Recruiter from prior service	1.7
I did not learn about WTC; I reported for 9 weeks of BCT, but was then told to report to WTC.	1.3
From former WTC students	1.2

(n=1289)

Question 2. If you learned about the WTC from a military recruiter, how knowledgeable was that recruiter on the detailed aspects of the WTC? (n=1289)

Responses	Percent
Not at all knowledgeable	63.8
Somewhat knowledgeable	20.3
Not applicable, did not learn about WTC from a military recruiter	12.4
Very knowledgeable	1.8
Not marked	1.7

(n=1289)

Question 3. Based on the information you had about WTC prior to arriving at Ft. Knox, did you expect that... (n=1289)

Response	Percent Expected
this would be a transition course	79.0
this would be an Army introductory course	65.2
there would be strenuous physical fitness requirements	56.9
this would be an Army gentleman's course	43.0
I would be taught by Drill Sergeants	39.9
I would go through basic combat training (BTC)	21.9

Response	Percent
I did not have any expectations	9.3

Question 4. During WTC training, did you suffer from any illness or injuries including stress related muscular joint injuries? (n=1289)

Responses	Percent
Yes, and I went on sick call	40.6
Yes, but I did not go on sick call	29.6
No	28.0
Not marked	1.9

Question 5. Please use the following scale to rate your WTC INSTRUCTORS as a group. (n=1289)

Instructor Rating Criteria	Percent					
	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Not marked
Sets high standards for Soldiers in terms of good order and discipline	3.2	7.8	22.1	33.0	32.7	1.2
Sets good examples by behaving the way they expect Soldiers to behave	8.2	13.8	25.3	25.8	25.4	1.6
Enforces standards they set for good behavior	4.9	9.9	25.1	32.0	26.4	1.7
Overall leadership effectiveness	6.5	12.2	25.1	30.3	23.6	2.3
Demonstrates technical competence	4.7	8.9	23.0	30.6	31.0	1.7
Treats WTC students with respect	24.7	18.5	24.8	15.9	14.6	1.6
Demonstrates Army values	6.5	10.6	26.4	28.8	25.9	1.9
Instills commitment to selfless service	5.3	9.6	24.7	33.4	25.2	1.9
Provides support and encouragement	12.3	15.5	26.4	23.8	20.2	1.8
Provides feedback on your training	10.7	17.9	28.6	23.3	17.6	1.9
Helps develop your skills/competencies	10.2	13.3	28.5	26.3	18.5	3.2
Respects your prior military experience and the job skills that you brought to the WTC	32.3	18.9	21.6	11.1	11.8	4.3

Question 6. How often were you treated as if you were a basic training recruit during the WTC? (n=1289)

Responses	Percent
Seldom, if ever	6.6
Sometimes	20.4
Often	19.9
Very Often	25.1
Always or almost always	25.1
Not marked	2.9

Question 7. To what extent was each of the following a problem for you during the WTC? (n=1289)

Problem	Percent					
	Little or no extent	Some extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent	Not marked
Available housing upon arrival	64.4	5.3	10.9	9.2	7.5	2.7
Available uniforms and related items	50.2	10.2	15.1	12.0	10.1	2.4
Ability to purchase needed items in PX, commissary or Shopette	24.1	21.6	25.4	16.6	10.2	2.3
Not enough training time	24.6	16.2	23.4	18.0	14.2	3.6
Too much downtime between training events	45.2	14.5	16.5	9.9	11.7	2.1
Not enough recovery time between physical events	20.8	18.2	23.1	15.7	20.4	1.8
Mental stress	29.7	22.3	24.9	11.9	8.7	2.4
Loss of pay or benefits	64.6	9.1	9.1	6.3	8.7	2.3
Loss of housing/benefits for family	75.9	6.1	7.1	3.8	4.8	2.3
Loss of rank/demotion	72.6	4.7	7.7	4.5	7.1	3.3
Length of time spent in reception battalion	35.1	13.1	16.8	11.7	20.6	2.7
Lack of proper information to prepare for the course	12.2	7.1	13.0	17.5	47.2	3.0

Question 8. For each WTC training event, do you think the amount of time allotted for each event was too short, just right, or too long? (n=1289)

Time allotted to	Percent			
	Too short	Just right	Too long	Not marked
Physical training	54.2	41.3	3.3	1.2
Basic Rifle Marksmanship	44.6	46.5	7.9	1.2
Land Navigation	57.9	38.7	2.2	1.2
Drill & Ceremony (D & C)	49.8	40.5	7.5	2.3
Army Customs & Courtesy	45.2	49.0	4.1	1.8
First Aid	28.5	62.9	6.8	1.9
Tactical Footmarches	28.0	61.4	9.1	1.5
Army Organization & Orientation	45.4	48.0	4.0	2.6
Squad External Evaluation (EXEVAL)	47.1	45.9	3.2	3.8

Question 9. Looking back on your experience in the WTC, which training course do you believe is best to meet the training needs of incoming Soldiers? (n=1289)

Responses	Percent
4 week WTC	44.4
9 week basic combat training (BCT)	50.2
Not marked	5.4

Question 10. What is your assignment upon your WTC graduation? (n=1289)

Assignment after graduation	Percent
Advanced Individual Training (AIT)	54.1
A Reserve duty unit	20.0
An Active duty unit assignment	7.5
Other (please explain)	7.1
Other training or schooling	4.0
One Station Unit Training (OSUT)	3.0
Don't know/not sure	3.0

Question 11. If you indicated that you are being assigned to a unit, based on what you know now about this unit, what is the likelihood that you will deploy to any of the following locations within 0-3 months of your WTC training? (n=1289)

Response	Percent
Not applicable; I am not going to a unit assignment	50.5
Not marked	49.5

Instructor Rating Criteria	Percent					
	Very unlikely	Unlikely	Neither likely nor unlikely	Likely	Very likely	Not marked
To Afghanistan	9.4	6.6	10.6	10.3	5.3	57.9
To Iraq	7.8	5.0	9.3	11.1	9.9	56.9
To elsewhere in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)	8.3	5.4	10.3	11.3	6.8	58.0
To other OCONUS site not listed above	10.6	6.0	11.0	8.5	5.7	58.2

Question 12. Overall, how confident are you that the WTC has prepared you to succeed in your next duty assignment? (n=1289)

Response	Percent
Very confident	12.7
Confident	32.5
Somewhat confident	37.3
Not at all confident	12.8
Not sure	3.5
Not marked	1.2

Question 13. Will you recommend the WTC to others? (n=1289)

Response	Percent
Definitely yes	14.2
Probably yes	33.8
Probably no	23.1
Definitely no	17.9
Don't know	9.8
Not marked	1.2

Question 14. Overall, how satisfied are you with your WTC experience? (n=1289)

Response	Percent
Very Satisfied	7.9
Satisfied	23.6
Neutral or mixed feelings	39.8
Dissatisfied	17.6
Very dissatisfied	9.8
Not marked	1.3

SECTION 2: THE ARMY AND YOU

Question 15. How important were each of the following reasons for joining/rejoining the Army? (n=1288)

Responses	Percent				
	Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Extremely important
Help fight the War on Terrorism	4.4	10.0	24.0	21.2	39.1
Serve country	2.6	6.5	20.1	21.0	48.0
Experience military life	19.3	16.6	24.1	17.7	20.5
Career opportunities/advancement	4.7	7.5	17.3	27.8	40.6
Training opportunities	4.6	7.1	21.7	29.3	35.7
Educational opportunities	5.0	9.6	17.9	24.1	41.8
Pay & benefits	6.4	8.8	20.1	24.4	38.4
Family support	15.2	7.7	16.2	19.1	39.4
To finish remaining years for retirement	15.8	9.4	15.9	17.7	39.1
Opportunity to travel	19.3	16.2	23.9	15.4	22.6
Lack of advancement in prior service	39.9	9.6	14.1	12.3	20.2
Could not stay in prior service (Reasons listed below):	64.3	4.0	6.4	3.5	8.8
○ Air Force downsizing ○ Navy downsizing ○ Too old ○ Medical discharge ○ Asked to change MOS ○ Dissatisfied with lack of advancement					

Question 16. If your prior service was any service OTHER than the Army, to what extent were the following incentives influential in your decision to join the Army and attend the WTC? (n=1042)

Response	Percent
Not applicable; my prior service was Army	14.9
Not applicable; I did not know about the WTC incentives	26.5

Response	Percent				
	Little or no extent	Some extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent
Ability to maintain prior rank	11.8	3.5	6.2	13.8	26.4
Ability to maintain military benefits	8.5	3.1	8.2	15.8	25.7
Ability to maintain MOS	31.2	5.0	7.8	6.5	10.3
4 weeks of training instead on 9 weeks of basic training	11.5	5.0	8.6	10.0	25.5

(n=1042)

Question 17. To what extent do you agree that the Army is obligated to provide each of the following to you? (n=1042)

	Percent				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
An attractive benefits package	2.7	5.1	15.2	38.7	36.6
Fair treatment	1.4	1.4	5.7	30.0	59.8
A relatively secure job	0.8	1.9	8.5	37.9	49.3
Feedback on your performance	1.2	1.3	9.0	35.2	51.4
Training	0.6	0.6	4.8	29.6	62.3
Leadership and direction	1.2	0.8	6.1	29.0	60.7
Opportunities for career development within the Army	1.2	1.2	6.7	30.0	59.2
Opportunities to use your skills and capabilities	1.3	1.3	6.5	30.2	58.9
A good atmosphere at work	1.6	3.3	15.2	32.1	45.6
Respect for personal situation	1.9	3.4	13.1	34.1	44.4
Opportunities for flexible working hours depending on your personal needs	7.7	14.0	26.4	25.7	24.5
Positive relationships between colleagues	2.3	5.6	16.5	34.8	38.0
Opportunities to show what you can do	1.6	1.7	10.0	33.1	50.9

Question 18. To what extent do you agree that you are obligated to provide each of the following to the Army? (n=1042)

Response	Percent				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Volunteer to do tasks that fall outside your job description	3.4	5.3	14.7	46.2	29.2
Perform your job in a reliable manner	0.6	0.5	2.8	24.3	70.5
Deal honestly with the Army	0.7	0.5	2.3	22.7	71.9
Work extra hours if needed to get the job done	0.7	1.3	7.5	34.3	54.8
Develop new skills as needed	0.7	1.2	3.4	33.2	59.7
Cooperate well with your colleagues	0.6	1.2	4.0	33.9	58.4
Assist your colleagues with their work	0.7	1.3	7.9	37.6	50.3
Use the organization's properties honestly	0.6	0.9	3.4	32.1	60.4
Take personal initiative to attend training courses	1.5	1.2	6.1	33.5	55.6
Remain with the Army for at least some years	3.7	3.6	13.0	29.4	48.4
Get along well with your colleagues	0.9	2.5	8.5	37.0	48.6
Follow the policies and norms of the Army	0.7	0.6	3.3	29.5	62.3

Question 19. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (n=1042)

	Percent				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
I feel like part of the family in the Army	5.1	8.6	31.3	34.6	19.1
The Army has a great deal of personal meaning for me	2.7	6.1	26.7	40.8	22.4
I feel a strong sense of belonging in the Army	4.2	8.2	33.2	31.7	21.3
I feel emotionally attached to the Army	5.7	12.4	38.9	24.4	15.0
It would be too costly for me to leave the Army in the near future	16.0	16.6	22.2	23.2	19.9
I am afraid of what might happen if I quit the Army without another job lined up	22.8	20.1	16.0	19.0	20.4
Too much of my life would be interrupted if I decided I wanted to leave the Army now	21.6	18.8	17.2	19.2	21.4
One of the problems with leaving the Army would be a lack of available alternatives	22.9	19.1	16.3	22.5	17.3
I do not feel any obligation to remain with the Army	29.2	26.2	20.4	13.9	8.4
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave the Army right now	6.3	7.8	18.1	34.6	31.2
I would feel guilty if I left the Army now	11.6	11.6	18.0	27.6	28.4
The Army deserves my loyalty	3.7	3.1	15.9	34.5	38.2
I would not leave the Army right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	4.7	6.1	16.9	33.4	35.9
I owe a great deal to the Army	11.2	12.0	26.7	26.6	19.3

Question 20. How important is each of the following to you personally? (n=1042)

Responses	Percent				
	Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Extremely important
Loyalty to the U.S. Army	1.7	5.3	19.2	27.5	44.0
Loyalty to your unit or organization	1.3	3.6	15.5	27.8	49.4
Taking responsibility for your actions and decisions	0.6	0.5	7.3	24.4	64.6
Putting what is good for your fellow Soldiers, unit, and the nation before your own welfare	1.5	3.2	12.2	28.6	52.3
Dedication to serving the United States, even to risking your life in its defense	1.5	2.4	12.7	23.6	57.1
Commitment to working as a member of a team	0.9	1.3	11.6	27.7	55.7
Dedication to learning your job and doing it well	0.4	0.7	8.3	23.7	64.8
Personal drive to succeed in your work and advance	0.3	1.0	6.4	23.9	66.1
Being honest, open and truthful	0.3	1.0	6.9	23.7	65.7
Being disciplined and courageous in battle	0.6	1.1	7.9	23.8	64.5
Standing up for what you firmly believe is right	0.6	1.1	6.1	20.8	69.4
Working with others tactfully and with military courtesy	0.3	1.3	9.4	30.1	56.5
Exhibiting excellent military bearing and appearance	0.6	1.3	11.5	26.0	58.2
High moral standards both on-duty and off-duty	0.6	1.4	9.8	25.5	59.9
Building and maintaining physical fitness and stamina	0.4	1.3	8.5	24.8	61.8

SECTION 3:YOUR BACKGROUND

Question 22. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin or ancestry (of any race)? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

Responses	Percent Checked
No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry	80.7
Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano	6.4
Yes, Puerto Rican	1.6
Yes, Cuban	0.3
Yes, other Hispanic/Spanish	5.6

Question 23. What is your race? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

Responses	Percent Checked
American Indian or Alaska native (e.g., Eskimo, Aleut)	4.8
Asian (e.g., Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese)	3.9
Black or African American	16.6
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (e.g., Samoan, Guamanian, Chamorro)	1.2
White	70.6

Question 24. What is the highest level of education you have completed? MARK ONE. (n=1287)

Responses	Percent Checked
Less than high school, but no diploma, certificate, or GED	0.8
High school completed with diploma or GED	30.2
Vocational/technical school graduate	8.3
Some college	42.9
Bachelor's degree	10.6
Some graduate school	2.3
Master's degree or equivalent	2.3
Doctorate degree or professional degree, such as MD, DDS, JD	0.5

Question 26. What is your current marital status? MARK ONE (n= 1287)

Responses	Percent Checked
Single	34.3
Married	50.7
Legally separated	1.4
Divorced	11.2

Question 27. What was the last service you belonged to prior to your current enlistment in the Army? MARK ONE. (n=1287)

Responses	Percent Checked
Active Duty Army	11.3
Army Reserve	3.5
Army National Guard	4.6
Active Duty Air Force	19.7
Air Force Reserve	4.2
Air National Guard	3.6
Active Duty Navy	33.4
Navy Reserve	13.1
Active Duty Marines	3.6
Marines Reserve	0.4
Active Duty Coast Guard	0.3
Coast Guard Reserve	0.5
Other	0.5

Question 28. What was your highest rank prior to joining the Army? MARK ONE.

Responses	Percent
E1	2.1
E2	3.8
E3	17.6
E4	48.6
E5	21.4
E6	3.5
E7	0.5
E8	0.2
E9	0.1

Question 29. What is your current rank in the Army? MARK ONE (n=1287).

Responses	Percent
PV1 (E1)	3.2
PV2 (E2)	16.2
PFC (E3)	21.5
CPL/SPC (E4)	9.1
SGT (E5)	16.4
SSG (E6)	1.5

Question 32. During the past 3 months, which of the following BEST DESCRIBES what you were doing prior to joining/rejoining the Army? MARK ALL THAT APPLY. (n=1287)

Responses	Percent Checked
Full time student	12.7
Part-time student	6.5
Working full time as civilian	61.0
Working part time as civilian	8.6
Unemployed	8.2
Full time homemaker	1.8
Active duty military	9.6
Reserve duty military	12.2
Other	4.5

Question 33. At the present time, what are your Army career plans? MARK ONE. (n=1287)

Responses	Percent
To stay in the Army until retirement	61.5
To stay in the Army beyond my present obligation, but not necessarily to retirement	21.1
To leave the Army <u>upon completion</u> of my present obligation	12.0
To leave the Army <u>before completion</u> of my present obligation	1.6

Appendix F

Results of ARI On-Line Survey

In this appendix are the detailed response from the survey that was administered on-line during the period July-September 2005. The survey was taken by 238 WTC Soldiers who had graduated from WTC Classes 001 through 006. The ARI control number for this instrument is PT: 60-78/MAR 05.

SECTION 1: THE WTC AND YOU

Question 1. How did you first learn about the WTC? (n=238)

Responses	Percent
U.S. Army Recruiter	64.3
Other	18.9
Internet sources	9.2
Installations/post newspaper	4.6
Recruiter from prior service	2.5
I did not learn about WTC; I reported for 9 weeks of BCT, but was then told to report to WTC.	10.9
From former WTC students	0.8

Question 2. If you learned about the WTC from a military recruiter, how knowledgeable was that recruiter on the detailed aspects of the WTC? (n=238)

Responses	Percent
Not at all knowledgeable	50.0
Somewhat knowledgeable	27.3
Not applicable, did not learn about WTC from a military recruiter	21.9
Very knowledgeable	0.8

Question 3. Did you have any expectations about WTC prior to arriving at Fort Knox? (n=238)

Response	Percent
No, I did not have any expectations	42.4
Yes	57.6

Question 4. Based on the information you had about the WTC prior to arriving at Fort Knox, did you expect that...

Response	Percent Expected
this would be a transition course	85.4
there would be strenuous physical fitness requirements	78.1
this would be an Army introductory course	63.5
this would be an Army gentleman's course	57.7
I would be taught by Drill Sergeants	54.7
I would go through basic combat training (BTC)	45.3

Question 5. During WTC training, did you suffer from any illness or injuries including stress related muscular joint injuries? (n=238)

Responses	Percent
Yes, and I went on sick call	33.6
Yes, but I did not go on sick call	31.1
No	35.3

Question 6. Please use the following scale to rate your WTC INSTRUCTORS as a group.
(n=238)

Instructor Rating Criteria	Percent				
	Very poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very good
Sets high standards for Soldiers in terms of good order and discipline	2.9	6.3	21.4	37.8	31.5
Sets good examples by behaving the way they expect Soldiers to behave	6.3	10.9	15.6	33.6	33.6
Enforces standards they set for good behavior	2.9	9.2	17.2	35.7	34.9
Overall leadership effectiveness	5.0	10.5	18.1	30.7	35.7
Demonstrates technical competence	2.9	6.3	10.5	29.8	50.4
Treats WTC students with respect	22.7	18.5	25.6	15.1	18.1
Demonstrates Army values	5.0	9.7	21.0	33.6	30.7
Instills commitment to selfless service	2.5	8.4	20.6	45.4	23.1
Provides support and encouragement	8.8	14.7	24.8	29.4	22.3
Provides feedback on your training	8.4	14.7	27.3	27.3	22.3
Helps develop your skills/competencies	8.0	10.9	28.6	30.3	22.3
Respects your prior military experience and the job skills that you brought to the WTC	29.4	19.3	19.3	17.6	14.3

Question 7. How often were you treated as if you were a basic training recruit during the WTC? (n=238)

Responses	Percent
Seldom, if ever	8.4
Sometimes	26.9
Often	16.4
Very Often	22.3
Always or almost always	26.1

Question 8. To what extent was each of the following a problem for you during the WTC? (n=238)

Problem	Percent				
	Little or no extent	Some extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent
Available housing upon arrival	77.3	6.7	5.9	5.0	5.0
Available uniforms and related items	63.9	8.4	6.7	11.3	9.7
Ability to purchase needed items in PX, commissary or Shopette	46.64	18.1	13.9	13.0	8.4
Not enough training time	31.9	17.2	24.0	15.6	11.3
Too much downtime between training events	61.3	16.4	8.0	8.0	6.3
Not enough recovery time between physical events	34.45	18.1	19.3	16.8	11.3
Mental stress	51.3	28.6	13.9	3.4	2.9
Loss of pay or benefits	61.3	8.4	11.8	7.1	11.3
Loss of housing/benefits for family	78.2	7.6	7.6	1.3	5.5
Loss of rank/demotion	64.7	8.8	5.5	3.8	17.2
Length of time spent in reception battalion	46.2	15.5	17.2	10.1	10.9
Lack of proper information to prepare for the course	17.7	11.3	22.7	15.1	33.2

Question 9. For each WTC training event, do you think the amount of time allotted for each event was too short, just right, or too long? (n=238)

Time allotted to	Percent		
	Too short	Just right	Too long
Physical training	53.8	44.5	1.7
Basic Rifle Marksmanship	34.9	60.9	4.2
Land Navigation	45.4	53.4	1.3
Drill & Ceremony (D & C)	52.9	42.9	4.2
Army Customs & Courtesy	48.3	48.8	2.9
First Aid	34.0	60.5	5.5
Tactical Footmarches	29.0	66.4	4.6
Army Organization & Orientation	43.3	54.6	2.1
Squad External Evaluation (EXEVAL)	41.2	54.6	4.2

Question 10. Looking back on your experience in the WTC, which training course do you believe is best to meet the training needs of incoming Soldiers? (n=238)

Responses	Percent
4 week WTC	58.0
9 week basic combat training (BCT)	42.0

Question 11. What is your assignment upon your WTC graduation? (n=238)

Assignment after graduation	Percent
Advanced Individual Training (AIT)	8.8
A Reserve duty unit	7.1
An Active duty unit assignment	75.6
Other (please explain)	6.7
Other training or schooling	1.7

Question 12. Overall, how confident are you that the WTC has prepared you to succeed in your next duty assignment? (n=238)

Response	Percent
Very confident	19.3
Confident	25.6
Somewhat confident	3.8
Not at all confident	28.6
Not sure	22.7

Question 13. Overall, how satisfied are you with your WTC experience? (n=238)

Response	Percent
Very Satisfied	14.3
Satisfied	26.9
Neutral or mixed feelings	34.5
Dissatisfied	15.1
Very dissatisfied	9.2

SECTION 2: THE ARMY AND YOU

Question 14. How important were each of the following reasons for joining/rejoining the Army?
(n=238)

Responses	Percent				
	Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Extremely important
Help fight the War on Terrorism	10.1	10.5	24.4	16.0	39.1
Serve country	5.0	10.1	17.2	18.5	49.2
Experience military life	22.3	19.8	24.0	17.2	16.8
Career opportunities/advancement	7.6	8.0	24.0	24.4	36.1
Training opportunities	6.7	8.8	28.2	23.5	32.8
Educational opportunities	8.4	9.2	21.0	26.9	34.5
Pay & benefits	10.5	8.0	22.3	23.5	35.7
Family support	21.0	9.7	19.3	16.4	33.6
To finish remaining years for retirement	17.7	11.3	18.1	17.7	35.3
Opportunity to travel	21.9	18.5	29.9	13.0	16.8
Lack of advancement in prior service	39.5	11.8	13.9	14.3	20.6
Could not stay in prior service (Reasons listed below):	74.0	2.9	9.2	2.9	10.9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Air Force downsizing <input type="radio"/> Navy downsizing <input type="radio"/> Medical discharge <input type="radio"/> Dissatisfied with lack of advancement opportunities <input type="radio"/> Personal reasons 					

Question 15. Was your prior service with any service OTHER than the Army? (n=238)

Response	Percent
No; my prior service was with Army	33.2
Yes	66.8

Question 16. To what extent were the following incentives influential in your decision to join the Army and attend the WTC? (n=159)

Response	Percent				
	Little or no extent	Some extent	Moderate extent	Great extent	Very great extent
Ability to maintain prior rank	32.7	8.2	13.8	17.6	27.7
Ability to maintain military benefits	21.4	8.2	20.8	16.4	33.3
Ability to maintain MOS	72.3	6.9	12.6	1.3	6.9
4 weeks of training instead on 9 weeks of basic training	35.2	8.8	15.1	10.7	30.2

Question 17. To what extent do you agree that *the Army is* obligated to provide each of the following to you? (n=238)

	Percent				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
An attractive benefits package	4.6	4.2	13.0	42.4	35.7
Fair treatment	1.3	2.5	4.2	30.3	61.8
A relatively secure job	0.8	0.4	7.1	39.9	51.7
Feedback on your performance	1.7	2.1	7.1	34.0	55.0
Training	1.3	0	4.6	29.8	64.3
Leadership and direction	1.7	2.1	5.0	26.1	65.1
Opportunities for career development within the Army	1.3	1.7	5.9	28.2	63.0
Opportunities to use your skills and capabilities	1.7	0.8	5.9	37.0	54.6
A good atmosphere at work	1.7	1.7	8.4	42.9	45.4
Respect for personal situation	1.7	2.9	10.5	42.0	42.9
Opportunities for flexible working hours depending on your personal needs	5.9	16.4	24.4	32.8	20.6
Positive relationships between colleagues	1.7	5.5	14.7	41.6	36.6
Opportunities to show what you can do	2.5	2.1	5.5	39.1	50.8

Question 18. Would you recommend the WTC to others? (n=238)

Response	Percent
Probably yes	31.5
Definitely yes	31.1
Probably no	16.4
Definitely no	10.5
Don't know	10.5

Question 19. To what extent do you agree that you are obligated to provide each of the following to the Army? (n=238)

Response	Percent				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
Volunteer to do tasks that fall outside your job description	0.8	6.7	13.5	43.7	35.3
Perform your job in a reliable manner	0.4	0	2.1	24.4	73.1
Deal honestly with the Army	0.4	0	2.5	25.6	71.4
Work extra hours if needed to get the job done	0	0.8	4.2	37.4	57.6
Develop new skills as needed	0.4	0.4	2.1	32.8	64.3
Cooperate well with your colleagues	0	1.3	3.8	32.4	62.6
Assist your colleagues with their work	0.4	0.8	3.8	46.2	48.7
Use the organization's properties honestly	0	0.4	2.5	32.8	64.3
Take personal initiative to attend training courses	0.4	0.4	5.0	34.5	59.7
Remain with the Army for at least some years	3.4	3.8	13.9	30.7	48.3
Get along well with your colleagues	0.4	2.1	5.9	40.0	51.7
Follow the policies and norms of the Army	0	0.4	4.6	36.6	58.4

Question 20. To what extent do you agree with the following statements? (n=238)

	Percent				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
I feel like part of the family in the Army	6.7	12.2	23.5	37.4	20.2
The Army has a great deal of personal meaning for me	7.6	5.9	19.3	35.3	31.9
I feel a strong sense of belonging in the Army	8.0	8.0	22.3	35.7	26.1
I feel emotionally attached to the Army	10.5	11.8	30.3	28.2	19.3
It would be too costly for me to leave the Army in the near future	19.3	18.5	23.5	19.3	19.3
I am afraid of what might happen if I quit the Army without another job lined up	26.1	18.9	18.5	16.0	20.6
Too much of my life would be interrupted if I decided I wanted to leave the Army now	24.4	14.3	16.8	20.2	24.4
One of the problems with leaving the Army would be a lack of available alternatives	25.2	22.7	17.7	21.9	12.6
I do not feel any obligation to remain with the Army	21.0	30.0	25.2	12.2	11.8
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave the Army right now	11.3	6.7	17.6	40.0	24.4
I would feel guilty if I left the Army now	17.7	16.8	19.8	24.5	21.0
The Army deserves my loyalty	4.2	3.4	13.9	40.8	37.8
I would not leave the Army right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	10.1	9.7	18.9	30.3	31.1
I owe a great deal to the Army	15.1	11.8	22.3	26.9	24.0

Question 21. How important is each of the following to you personally? (n=238)

Responses	Percent				
	Not at all important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Extremely important
Loyalty to the U.S. Army	4.6	9.7	20.2	26.5	39.1
Loyalty to your unit or organization	3.8	8.8	20.6	24.4	42.4
Taking responsibility for your actions and decisions	0.4	0.8	8.4	24.0	66.4
Putting what is good for your fellow Soldiers, unit, and the nation before your own welfare	2.1	5.5	15.6	25.6	51.3
Dedication to serving the United States, even to risking your life in its defense	2.9	7.1	12.6	20.6	56.7
Commitment to working as a member of a team	0	2.5	19.3	22.7	55.5
Dedication to learning your job and doing it well	0.4	.04	10.9	21.0	67.2
Personal drive to succeed in your work and advance	0.4	2.9	10.9	24.8	60.9
Being honest, open and truthful	0.4	1.3	11.3	21.0	66.0
Being disciplined and courageous in battle	0	2.1	13.0	17.7	67.2
Standing up for what you firmly believe is right	0	1.3	9.2	19.3	70.2
Working with others tactfully and with military courtesy	0	1.7	19.3	26.9	52.1
Building and maintaining physical fitness and stamina	0	3.8	13.5	25.2	57.6

SECTION 3:YOUR BACKGROUND

Question 23. Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin or ancestry (of any race)? MARK ALL THAT APPLY. (n=238)

Responses	Percent Checked
No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish ancestry	87.8
Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano	6.7
Yes, Puerto Rican	2.9
Yes, Cuban	0.4
Yes, other Hispanic/Spanish	4.2

Question 24. What is your race? MARK ALL THAT APPLY. (n=238)

Responses	Percent Checked
American Indian or Alaska native (e.g., Eskimo, Aleut)	5.9
Asian (e.g., Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese)	3.4
Black or African American	14.3
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (e.g., Samoan, Guamanian, Chamorro)	0.4
White	77.3

Question 25. What is the highest level of education you have completed? MARK ONE. (n=238)

Responses	Percent Checked
High school completed with diploma or GED	21.9
Vocational/technical school graduate	6.7
Some college	56.7
Bachelor's degree	12.6
Some graduate school	0.8
Master's degree or equivalent	0.4
Doctorate degree or professional degree, such as MD, DDS, JD	0.8

Question 27. What is your current marital status? MARK ONE (n= 238)

Responses	Percent Checked
Single	24.4
Married	63.5
Legally separated	2.5
Divorced	9.7

Question 28. What was the last service you belonged to prior to your current enlistment in the Army? MARK ONE. (n=238)

Responses	Percent Checked
Active Duty Army	22.3
Army Reserve	5.0
Army National Guard	9.2
Active Duty Air Force	12.6
Air Force Reserve	3.8
Air National Guard	2.5
Active Duty Navy	29.0
Navy Reserve	5.5
Active Duty Marines	5.0
Marines Reserve	0.4
Active Duty Coast Guard	1.3
Coast Guard Reserve	0.4
Other	2.9

Question 29. What was your highest rank prior to joining the Army? MARK ONE. (n=238)

Responses	Percent
E1	3.4
E2	3.4
E3	12.6
E4	51.3
E5	25.2
E6	3.4
E7	0.4
E8	0
E9	0.4

Question 30. What is your current rank in the Army? MARK ONE (n=238).

Responses	Percent
PV1 (E1)	0.4
PV2 (E2)	3.4
PFC (E3)	22.3
CPL/SPC (E4)	59.2
SGT (E5)	12.6
SSG (E6)	2.1

Question 33. During the past 3 months, which of the following BEST DESCRIBES what you were doing prior to joining/rejoining the Army? MARK ALL THAT APPLY. (n=238)

Responses	Percent Checked
Full time student	11.8
Part-time student	8.4
Working full time as civilian	60.5
Working part time as civilian	8.8
Unemployed	5.5
Full time homemaker	1.7
Active duty military	17.2
Reserve duty military	10.1
Other	5.9

Question 34. At the present time, what are you Army career plans? MARK ONE. (n=238)

Responses	Percent
To stay in the Army until retirement	56.3
To stay in the Army beyond my present obligation, but not necessarily to retirement	18.9
To leave the Army <u>upon completion</u> of my present obligation	22.3
To leave the Army <u>before completion</u> of my present obligation	2.5